



तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

VISVA BHARATI
LIBRARY
SANTINIKETAN

D. G.

335

S657



SOCIALISM
&
THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

“Je ne propose rien, je n'impose rien : j'expose.” •

(Dunoyer, *De la liberté du travail*, Paris 1845.)

SOCIALISM AND THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

BY
WERNER SOMBART

PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AT THE
HANDELSHOCHSCHULE IN BERLIN, ETC.

TRANSLATED
FROM THE SIXTH (ENLARGED) GERMAN EDITION

WITH
INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

BY
M. EPSTEIN, M.A., PH.D.



LONDON: J. M. DENT & CO.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.
MCMIX

All rights reserved

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

THE motto facing the title-page of this book sets forth the author's aim clearly enough. He sees in Socialism one of the great movements of our time and he seeks to make clear what it is, and what it wants, and gives an account of its development almost down to the present day. How the work has been done the reader will be able to judge for himself.

The book has had an interesting history. It first appeared in 1896 and contained the substance of eight lectures on "Socialism and the Social Movement during the Nineteenth Century," which had been delivered at Zurich in the autumn of that year. The book ran to only 130 pages, but its sterling worth was soon recognized, so that in five years it passed through four editions and was translated into eleven languages.¹ The first four editions were substantially the same; there were only changes in style here and there.

That the book continued to have a wide circle of readers is proved by the fact that the number of languages into which it was translated reached seventeen, including Japanese, and that in Germany a fifth edition appeared in 1905. This extended to 329 pages and contained much

¹ The reader may be interested to learn what these were. Here is a list of them: French, Italian, Flemish, English, Swedish, Danish, Russian, Polish, Greek, Magyar and Armenian. The English version, which was a translation of the third edition, appeared in America and was from the pen of Mr. Atterbury.

that was new. Indeed, it is not too much to say that it was a new book. The standpoint of the author had not changed, but his treatment of the subject was fuller and his facts were brought up to date. It was in this edition, that he first gave a careful consideration to what he regarded as the two portions in the Marxian doctrines; the one he looked upon as alive and effective, the other as dead and useless.¹

As in the case of previous editions this, too, met with a popular reception, and in 1908 the sixth and enlarged edition came out, running to 395 pages. This is based on the fifth edition, which it virtually reproduces with only minor changes in parts, but it contains additional material in the later chapters and has a new and most interesting chapter on the latest phase of Socialism in France, which we have now learned to call Revolutionary Syndicalism, and a practical expression of which we recently beheld in the strike of the French post-office employees. It is the sixth edition which is here translated.

The book is well known wherever the German tongue is spoken. Its subject-matter is of distinct importance, and as for its style, nowhere is it more appropriate to say *le style c'est l'homme*. Those who know Sombart will comprehend my meaning.

He was born at Ermsleben on January 19, 1863. His father, a self-made man, had risen to the position of landed proprietor, and the boy grew up in luxury, and received the best possible education. Eventually he went to the University of Pisa and then to Berlin, where he became a pupil of Schmoller. From his early years he had shown a strong interest in Social reform, and the writings of Karl Marx and Lassalle made a deep impression upon

¹ Cf. p. 65 below.

him. He steeped himself in Marx, under whose influence, indeed, he remained for a long time.

In 1890 he became professor extraordinary¹ of Political Economy at the University of Breslau. His lectures attracted a very large number of students, so that session after session his classes had to be accommodated in the *auditorium maximum* at Breslau. And no wonder! Sombart is a fine speaker, and it was a real joy to listen to the tall, energetic figure, and to watch the changing expressions of his countenance. He spoke from notes, and the humour and the sly touches which spiced his lectures were characteristic of the man. He is a modern of the moderns, standing under the influence of Zola and Ibsen. He is all for progress, and he has the courage of his opinions, speaking out boldly even when he knew he would suffer in consequence. And he did suffer. His views, as may be imagined, did not find favour in the sight of the powers that be in reactionary Prussia, and he was not promoted to the status of ordinary professor at Breslau, though all the world agreed that this was his due. In 1905 when the Commercial College (Handelshochschule) was founded in Berlin, he received, and accepted, the call as professor of Political Economy.

If his lectures were excellent, his tutorial classes (Seminar) were no less so. I attended them in 1906 and 1907, and not only did we learn much, but we were inspired by the man. The Seminars were held once a week from 7.30 to 9 in the evening, and after the hour and a half of work, Sombart would accompany us to supper in a neighbouring restaurant. The professor in him was then hidden away, and the man, the personality, came to the surface. He was a delightful companion on those occa-

¹ Cf. note on p. 8 below.

viii TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

sions, with nothing of the proverbial German professor about him.

Yet he has the learning of the proverbial German professor, and he has given proof of it in several books, to say nothing of very many contributions to learned journals. Of the former, perhaps the following four are the most important. (1) *Socialism and the Social Movement*, which I am here introducing to English readers. (2) *Der moderne Kapitalismus* (Modern Capitalism), which appeared in two volumes in 1902, is his principal work, and contains the first instalment of a new system of Political Economy. Critics of repute did not agree with a goodly number of the views put forward in this book, but all of them praised its vast learning, and recognized that the work was one that mattered, and would have to be considered by workers in the field of economics. (3) *Die deutsche Volkswirtschaft im 19ten Jahrhundert* (The economic progress of Germany in the nineteenth century) appeared in 1903, and though it must be regarded as a scientific treatise, reads more like a romance. For here, as everywhere, Sombart attaches as much importance to beauty of form as to fulness of subject matter. Fortunately, he has not only the faculty of exact definition and keen observation but also the gift of a delightful descriptive writer. (4) *Das Proletariat* (The Proletariat) appeared in 1906 and deals fully with a subject which he has made specially his own.

Sombart, however, is no mere theorist. He believes that the economist should go out into the world and supplement the knowledge gained in the study and the archives by experience of actual life. While he lived in Breslau he was for a long time a member of the town council and was very much interested in the Society for Social Reform, of the local branch of which he was one of the moving

spirits. As to his political views, it has been said that he combines a strong individualist conception of liberty with Socialist inclinations. His friends jestingly call him "The Demagogue of the Salon."

So much for the book and its author. I hope I have not been altogether unsuccessful in clothing the author's narrative in an English form worthy of the original. I have spared no pains in this direction, for I believe the book deserves it. And if this translation finds favour with the English-reading public, I shall be amply rewarded for my labours.

I have added a few notes in the hope that they may prove helpful to the English reader.

I must not conclude without expressing my best thanks to Mrs. Erskine Childers for many valuable suggestions in the final revision of the book.

M. EPSTEIN.

London, June 1, 1909.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

THE MEANING OF SOCIALISM AND THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

Socialism, Social Movement and social class—The different social classes—Calling and class—Political party and class—What is Capitalism?—The bourgeoisie—The proletariat—Its composition—Its nature—The psychological foundations of the modern Social Movement—Definition of Socialism and the Social Movement—The aims of this Book	p. 1
---	------

PART ONE—SOCIALISM

CHAPTER I

THE UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES OF MODERN SOCIALISM

Classical political economy—Reform and Revolutionary literature—The Reformers—Reactionary literature—Socialist literature—Its elements: Optimism—Gospel of work—Radical Democracy—The belief in the supreme influence of a social order—Criticism of money-worship, and of private property—The different Socialist systems and their classification	p. 19
--	-------

CHAPTER II

RATIONAL SOCIALISM

I. *Utopian Socialism.*

The older Socialist systems the outcome of eighteenth-century philosophy—Their fundamental ideas: Optimistic metaphysics—Belief in a "natural order" of Society—The rationalism—Value of knowledge as a means of propaganda—Use of the platform and the press—Example as well as precept—Resort to force deprecated, and to political effort—Why the older Socialists were Utopians—They under-estimated the power of their opponents, and over-estimated their own—Their dreams	p. 31
--	-------

II. *Anarchism.*

Anarchism also a product of the rationalistic philosophy of the eighteenth century—It distinguishes between the "natural" order and the existing order of Society—Its glorification of Reason—Its belief in Propaganda—The newest method: Propaganda by deed—The appeal to force in history: View of Anarchism—The reign of Terror and Robespierre p. 40

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDATION OF HISTORICAL SOCIALISM

Historical and realistic reaction in all science at the beginning of the nineteenth century—Criticism of political constitutions—The new theory of Society and the State—Its practical application—Its influence on Socialist thought—Louis Blanc, Lorenz von Stein—Karl Marx: his life, his character, his works—*The Communist Manifesto*—Outline of its principles—The Socialist end in view—Class conflicts—The influence of the teaching of Marx on the development of Socialism and of the Social Movement p. 47

CHAPTER IV

THE TEACHING OF MARX CRITICIZED

I. *Contradictions in the Marxian Theory.*

The view expressed in the first editions of this book—The conception of "two souls" in Marx and the opposition to it—Doubts as to its correctness—Engels v. Marx?—There are contradictions in the teaching of Marx—Proved by the theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat . . . p. 64

II. *The Theory of Capitalist Development.*

The evolutionary theory of Marx—Criticism—(1) The theory of concentration—(2) The theory of socialization—Have we reached the preliminary conditions for the arrival of Socialism?—(3) The theory of accumulation—(4) The theory of pauperization—(5) The theory of self-destruction p. 71

III. *Scientific Socialism superseded.*

Separation of Socialism from Science—Socialism and views of the world—Socialism and religion—The longing for ideals—Marxian teaching lacks ideals—Idealism and Evolution—The different standpoints of the Social theorists and of the Politicians—Ideal and political programme—The movement away from Marx towards Idealism—Socialism of to-day will develop p. 87

CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER V

REVOLUTIONARY SYNDICALISM

I. *Its Meaning.*

Strange name—Where it first arose—Its literature—Its ideas—Its criticism of official Socialism—The degeneration of the latter—Trade-Union and political party—Trade-Unions the molecules of the new order of Society—The revolutionary will of the proletariat is the motive power in all changes—Care of the revolutionary will—Importance of a General Strike as a means to the desired end—Syndicalism and anti-militarism p. 98

II. *Its Origin.*

(1) *Philosophically*: Relation of Syndicalism to Marx—Elements in the new system from other sources. (2) *Geographically*: France the land of its origin—Specific characteristics of the French people, of French history, and of French economic life—All throw light on the new theories p. 107

III. *Its Influence.*

It stimulates thought—Its ideals are old—Its criticism of modern civilization correct—Its attempts at a solution unsatisfactory—It misapprehends the conditions of modern civilization—Its criticism of the theory of social progress current in official Socialist circles correct—Its own teaching inadequate—Educating up to Socialism—Mistaken view of human nature—The theory of Trade-Unions—Trade-Unions a preparation for Socialism—The General Strike utopian p. 113

PART TWO—THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

CHAPTER I

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

What we understand by the term "Early History" in this connection—Participation of the proletariat in general revolutions—The Revolution of 1789—The Revolution of 1793—The Revolutions of 1830, 1832 and 1848—The beginnings of the Proletarian Movement—The struggle against undertakers, machines and factories—Struggle against Liberal policy—The German Labour Movement of 1848—The first attempts at a Trade-Union—The Chartist Movement in England p. 131

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL PECULIARITIES

Three national types :

I. *The English Type.*

English labourers turn from Socialism after the failure of the Chartist Movement—The creation of the modern Trade-Union and of a Trade-Union policy—The foundation of the first co-operative stores—Reasons for the foundation—Idealistic explanation—Realistic explanation—The Labour Movement in the United States a repetition of the one in England *p.* 144

II. *The French Type.*

Special characteristics of the Social Movement in France : Nervousness, factions, clubs, riots—History of the Social Movement in France—Revolutionary types—History of the Socialist parties—The characteristics explained by the nature of the people and its history . . *p.* 156

III. *The German Type.*

Development of the Social Movement in Germany—Ferdinand Lassalle—Movement filled with the spirit of Marx, on death of Lassalle—The Erfurt Programme—German Social Democracy inclined to participate in the parliamentary system—Characteristics of the German type explained by the personality of the founders, by the nature of the German people, and by the circumstances of the time—Powerlessness of the Liberal parties . . *p.* 165

CHAPTER III

THE TENDENCY TO UNIFORMITY

Preliminary remarks.

I. "*Proletarians of all lands, unite !*"

The beginnings of an International Labour Movement—The foundation of the International Workmen's Association—Influence on it of the Marxian spirit—Opposition from within—Michael Bakunin—Dissolution of the I.W.A.—The historic importance of the "Old" International Association—The so-called "New" International Association—Its characteristics—The outer aspect of the International Socialist Congresses—Their inner aspect—The "International Socialist Bureau"—International organization of Trade-Unions—International secretariates . . *p.* 175

II. *The Principles of Social Democratic Policy.*1. *Internationalism.*

Internationalism a common characteristic of the modern Social Movement—The nature of Proletarian Inter-

CONTENTS

xv

nationalism—Opposed to Chauvinism and Imperialism—
Decisions of the Paris Congress in 1900—Of the Amsterdam Congress in 1904—The Sixteenth International Congress of Miners—The anti-military resolutions at the Stuttgart Congress in 1907—Proletarian anti-militarism in the past—In the present—No conflict between Socialism and Nationalism—Socialistic view of Nationalism—Political and “cultural” patriotism—“National Socialism”—Concessions made to the prevailing system—The Chauvinism of German Social Democracy . *p.* 193

2. *The Inner Political Programme.*

The Paris Congress in 1900 settled the politics of Social Democracy—Its component parts—The exclusion of those who do not share the common faith—Growth of the programme of the Social Democracy in vogue to-day—The three component parts of the Socialist Movement—Self-help not opposed to Socialism—The real and apparent contradictions in Social Democracy—The influence of “Revisionism” over-estimated—Different views on the present situation—Contrast between Principles and Life—Between the doctrinaire and the practical man . . . *p.* 211

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

I. *Germany.*

Social Democracy the representative of the proletariat—Its anti-revolutionary politics—The opposing parties within Social Democracy—Their latest experiences—Revolutionary ideas discarded—The elections of 1907—The development of German Trade-Unions—The Co-operative Movement and the working classes *p.* 224

II. *France.*

The movement accustoming itself to parliamentary methods—The latest history of the Socialist parties—The Trade-Union Movement—The influence of the Revolutionary Syndicalist Movement—Retrograde movement towards revolution—The sphere of influence of Syndicalism—The Co-operative Movement in France . . . *p.* 233

III. *England.*

The English working classes and Cobdenism—The new unions—Decrease in the importance of the Trade-Union Movement—Hostile feeling towards the Trade-Unions—Lack of progress in the movement—History of Socialism in England—The Labour Representation Committee founded—The parliamentary elections of 1906—Influence in municipal government *p.* 240

	PAGE
IV. <i>Australia</i>	253
V. <i>Belgium</i>	256
VI. <i>Denmark</i>	259
VII. <i>Holland</i>	261
VIII. <i>Italy</i>	262
IX. <i>Norway</i>	266
X. <i>Austria-Hungary</i>	267
XI. <i>Russia</i>	269
XII. <i>Sweden</i>	269
XIII. <i>Switzerland</i>	271
XIV. <i>United States of America</i>	272

CONCLUSION

The result of all Socialist effort hitherto has resulted in the movement of the masses—The Social Movement cannot be stayed—Its present form necessary—What class struggles really mean—The work of the present : Social reform—Relation of Social Democracy to other political parties—Powerlessness of the German Social Democracy—Ethical spirit introduced into the class conflict—The form of the social struggle—Limited sense of the truth of the dictum : "War is the father of all things" . p. 279

APPENDIX.—Parallel Chronological Table of the Social Movement from 1750 to 1907 p. 288

SOCIALISM AND THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

INTRODUCTION

THE MEANING OF SOCIALISM AND THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

SOCIALISM, in the meaning of the word here adopted, is the intellectual embodiment of the modern Social Movement. That, in its turn, is the conception of all the attempts at emancipation on the part of the proletariat—one of the social classes of our time. In order fully to understand the subject under discussion it will be necessary to form a true notion of what is meant by a social class in general, and in particular of the social class which is of special interest to us here.

By the term "social class," then, I understand a social group, the individuals of which are the representatives of some economic system. In using the words "economic system" I mean a given economic order, or an economic condition of things, which is characterized by one or more prominent economic principles. Any economic order is, in my view, the sum-total of all legal and moral ideas which regulate production and distribution for the time being; and economic principles is the name I give to that chain of motives which influences the economic activities of individuals. This will become clearer when we apply these abstract ideas to concrete conditions of the present day.

The idea of social classes and the principles underlying them first arose in France. In France the events of the

great revolution, and perhaps to a greater degree those of the restoration and of the July revolution, served as an object lesson to historians, showing them the component parts of modern society. The writings of Guizot, Mignet and Louis Blanc already contain all that we know to-day of the origin and characteristics of social classes. Their presentation of the subject has been adopted by writers of other lands, and the Germans still follow, even to the technical terms, along the lines laid down by the great French historians and their German disciples, of whom the most influential were Lorenz von Stein and Karl Marx. Four classes are thus distinguished in modern society—

1. The nobility and gentry, or feudal party, which corresponds roughly to the feudal aristocracy and which in Germany is called the Junker party. These are the representatives of a feudal system of land holding or, in other words, of a patriarchal manorial system.

2. The lower middle class, which I have characterized as the class of manual labourers in the broadest sense, stands for a system of industry organized on traditional lines and much like the guild system in the Middle Ages.

3. The bourgeoisie or middle class *par excellence*, which is the representative of the capitalist system; and the opposite pole to it, the antithesis of the bourgeoisie.

4. The proletariat.¹

Our concern is with the last two classes, more especially with the fourth. We must therefore attempt to make ourselves more fully acquainted with them.

But first, in order to give a clearer idea of what is meant by a social class, let me show briefly the differences and the similarities that exist between the social class and other social groups for which, indeed, the former is often mistaken. The social class may cover part of the same

¹ Sombart is fond of making fine distinctions, and therefore it is that he separates the middle class into two sections. It is, perhaps, useful to distinguish people whom he places in his second class, the class called by the French *petite bourgeoisie*, from those who form the bulk of the middle class or bourgeoisie proper. He considers these divisions at great length in his *Modern Capitalism*.

ground as a division into callings or into grades of wealth, but it does not cover entirely the whole of that ground. A shoemaker may be at one and the same time a member of the lower middle class (in his capacity as manual labourer), of the proletariat (in his capacity as wage-earner) and of the bourgeoisie (in his capacity as manufacturer of boots and shoes). Again, a country gentleman may be as rich as a banker, a small independent manual labourer may be as poor as a member of the proletariat, yet they belong respectively to different social classes. And even where calling and grade of wealth are the same, it does not necessarily follow that two people will belong to one class. A locksmith of the lower middle class, working independently, may be just as wealthy as a minder in a machine factory, who gets a weekly wage.

The greatest impediment to the clear comprehension of the term "social class" is that it is confounded with "political party." A party and a class are by no means identical. A political party comes into being through some chance circumstance. It is held together by some idea sprung from the historical conditions of the day, which acts as a motive power. Often, too, a party continues to exist for no other reason than that it has been existing. The original idea which goes to form a party may be just as much national, religious, constitutional or humanitarian, as economic. It is true that often enough there is an inner relationship between political party and social class, yet stress must be laid on the fact that as often there is no connection whatever between the two.

It is possible, and indeed it is not infrequently the case, that the same political principles (*e. g.* the demand for full political freedom) are in the programme of different classes (*e. g.* of the bourgeoisie and of the proletariat). The same applies to religious conceptions. For example, the nobility and gentry, the lower middle class and often also the bourgeoisie, all stand for orthodoxy. Moreover, it is by no means exceptional for a political party to include members of different social classes. One need but recall

the Centre Party and the National Liberals in Germany in the eighteen-seventies, or the two great parties in England and in the United States. In the same way, a social class may contain members of different political parties. In Germany, the reactionary lower middle class is represented by the Centre Party and the Conservatives; the proletariat (*i. e.* the wage-earners) by the Centre and the Social Democratic Party. In the course of our considerations we shall see how important for the trend of the social movement in any country is the relationship which exists between the political parties and the social classes.

The object of these pages, then, is to describe the Social Movement of our age—the efforts, that is, at emancipation on the part of that social class which we have termed the proletariat, and which we have characterized for the present as the opposite pole to the middle class. The middle class in its turn we described as the representative of the capitalist system. The real nature of both classes will therefore be understood only when we have made ourselves acquainted with the economic organization of society which is dominant in our day. But we shall only be able to touch upon one or two of its underlying principles.

Capitalism is based on the private ownership of all commodities, and therefore also of those which are required for production—raw material, machinery, factories, land. Historic development has brought it about that production in these days is on a large scale; that is to say, it is carried on by the combination of many labourers under uniform direction. Thus, a thousand men are united to work a mine or a machine-factory, and hundreds to spin or weave in some big establishment. But the same development has also brought it about that those who work together in this way have not the same rights with regard to the means of production. Some own these means of production, and therefore become the directing factors in the work of production, and also owners of the commodities produced. The others, who form the great

mass of the workers, are shut out from the possession of the means of production. Hence it follows that, in order to live, they are forced to put their labour power (their only possession) at the disposal of those who do possess the means of production, in return for a money payment. This comes about by way of a wage contract, wherein the labourer, who possesses naught but his labour, agrees with the owner of the means of production, who is on that account the director of production, to undertake to render a certain amount of work in return for a certain amount of pay. When we bear in mind that all production depends on the combination of labour and the material means of production, then the capitalist system of production differs in the first instance from other systems in that the two factors of production are represented by two separate groups, which must meet and combine if a useful product is to ensue. In this the capitalist system differs from, let us say, the craft organization of industry, where the labourers were at the same time the owners of the means of production. But it differs likewise from slavery (where there was also a separation between two social groups) in that in the capitalist system the combination of the two groups comes about by free contract in what is known as the wages contrast.

The capitalist organization of society is characterized by the race for profit and by a peculiar form of mental activity in individuals which I call "economic rationalism." All economic activities are at bottom directed towards the increase of the money which is put into production, or, in technical language, towards the profitable investment of capital. To this end, all the thoughts of the capitalists or owners of the means of production, or of agents paid by them, are occupied day and night in an almost feverish restlessness in order to bring about the most practical and rational shaping of economic and technical processes.

The social class which stands for the interests of the capitalist system is the bourgeoisie, or middle class. It is made up, in the first place, of capitalist undertakers,

and in the second, of a large number of people whose interests are similar to those of the capitalist undertakers. I am thinking of the following elements: (1) All those who are economically independent (or who would like to be so), and are intent on profit-making, and who, moreover, desire a free legal system favourable to profit-making. That would include many shopkeepers, property-owners, agents, stock-jobbers and so on, and also the more modern of peasant proprietors. (2) All those who are not economically independent, but are associated with the capitalist undertaker in his activities, mostly as his representatives; and, as a rule, they participate in his economic success. That would include paid directors of companies, managers, foremen in large businesses and people like them. I have calculated that in Germany there are of people of this kind, who, of course, belong to the bourgeoisie, some $2\frac{1}{4}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions, i. e. about 3 to 5 per cent. of the population.

The class at the opposite pole to this—the one cannot be thought of without the other—I have called the proletariat,—the social class with which we are concerned in this book. In order to get a true conception of this class we must free ourselves from the picture of a ragged crowd which the term brought to mind before we read Karl Marx. The term “proletariat” is now used in a technical sense to describe that portion of the population which is in the service of capitalist undertakers in return for wages, and elements akin to them. The word in this meaning is taken from French writers, and was introduced into Germany by Lorenz von Stein in 1842.

Now who are these modern proletarians? How is their position distinguished? What is the goal of their attempts at emancipation, which we call the Social Movement?

The free wage-earners form the bulk of this class—all such persons as are employed in capitalist undertakings, leaving out, of course, those mentioned above as belonging to the bourgeoisie because their interests are bound up with the capitalist system. I have attempted to fix

their number for Germany, and conclude that it must be at most some seventeen millions, *i. e.* about a third of the population. When, in 1847, Marx said: "The proletarian movement is the independent movement of the frightfully large majority for their own interests," it was, perhaps, even for those days and for the whole of western Europe, a "frightfully large" exaggeration, at least when the term "proletariat" was taken in a narrow sense. But the picture becomes entirely different when to the true proletariat, to the full-bloods, are added the innumerable half-bloods—the poorest class of the population, *il popolino*—and also those amongst small farmers and mechanics who live the life of the proletariat, as well as the lowest grade among officials, such as those in the Post Office. When the meaning of the term is thus extended, it includes, for Germany, the whole of the so-called lower or working classes, numbering some thirty-five millions, or over two-thirds of the population. This is not the "frightfully large" majority of the population, but it is certainly very large. In other countries where production is based on the capitalist system, the conditions are no different.

Of the nature of the proletariat I can give only one or two hints here. From these it will be seen what influence the condition of this social class has on the movement of which its members are the agents. I deal with the whole subject fully in my work, *Das Proletariat*, which was published in 1906.

I have already pointed out that in order to get a true conception of the proletariat we must give up the idea of a ragged crowd. Indeed, the life of the proletarian is not always intolerable. Absolute distress is in no way a special characteristic of the class, though, to be sure, there are within it innumerable instances of want. But few proletarians are as badly off as the Russian peasant, or the Chinese coolie, or the Irish tenant, none of whom belong to the proletariat. Many a wage-earner, even in Europe, earns more than a University teacher, and in America the average income of this class falls not much

below the maximum salary of an extraordinary professor ¹ in Prussia.

And so, when we see the proletariat moving in order to emancipate itself, when we see that the movement is accompanied by feelings of hate, envy, or revolt, the cause of all this cannot be actual want.

It is probably much more the contrast which the worker observes between his own hard lot and the wealth of many who belong to the class of capitalist undertakers, wealth which, in his view, he has produced. For it is *he*, who toils and moils in their service. This contrast is daily brought to his notice not only when he sees how lavishly wealth demeans itself (the serf in the Middle Ages saw that too), but chiefly because he sees it created afresh daily, because the owners rise to power before his very eyes. On this point Frederick Albert Lange rightly lays stress when he says: "The feeling of envy never quite vanishes when the poor live beside the rich. It may become blunted in a condition of things which remain long stable. But where there are constant changes, and where the prevailing differences are brought more and more to the front, the feeling of envy becomes very strong. In addition to this (objective) uncertainty of all possession in this age of ours which the proletarian observes, there is the (from the point of view of the proletariat, subjective) uncertainty of the conditions of his existence—the fact that he is not sure to-day whether he will continue to be able to earn his living to-morrow. For a depression befalling the whole of the economic activities of our time may lead to much unemployment, and so increase the ranks of the hungry."

These constant changes bring home their position to the

¹ There are in Germany three stages through which a man generally passes to become a full University professor. He begins by being Privatdocent, when the University gives him a licence to teach, but no salary. The second stage is that of Professor-Extraordinary, and carries a salary with it. Then comes the Ordinary Professor, who, of course, receives a higher salary, and also has a voice in the government of the University.

working classes. The spread of education and intelligence, to which town life contributes no small share, enables them to think about the changes, and about the cause also of the contrast between their own position and that of the rich. They seem to see a secret reason for it all, the discovery of which started the modern movement of opposition on the part of the wage-earners. The secret reason is no other than this: that all the peculiarities of their life have their root not in any natural, unchangeable conditions, but in the special conditions of social organization, in the peculiar form of the prevailing economic system. "No man can put forth any special claim in the face of Nature, but in Society want at once becomes an injustice either to this social class or to that" (Hegel). Here we have the foundations on which a social movement can arise, for here we have something which may be attacked, viz. the existing social order.

As this criticism of the social order becomes keener, and as dissatisfaction and the wish for better things become stronger, another consideration naturally appears which weighs heavily on the proletariat—they feel their dependence on their masters. This is no longer a legal dependence, as it was in the days of slavery; but it is no less complete. It shows itself in the fact that the worker must look to the capitalist undertaker for employment, or he must starve. Hence, the complete subordination of the worker to the orders of the employer. Sometimes this subordination is coloured by medieval ideas, as when the factory owner regards himself as a kind of patriarch to "his people," and intermeddles in their private affairs. Sometimes, too, the same feeling is exercised in the sphere of politics, when the capitalist class uses its influence to lessen the share of the proletariat in the activities of the State and in the work of government.

These, then, are the causes responsible for the proletarian criticism of the existing social order. But we must look to yet other aspects of the life of the wage-earning class if we are fully to account for the prevailing ideas

which are to be found in all the attempts of the proletariat at emancipation. On the one hand, we have the tendency to communist organization of life; and on the other, the tendency to aggregation.

The latter follows immediately from the conglomeration of similarly situated wage-earners side by side, who have no other bond than that of their common work in the service of a capitalist undertaker; who are like so many grains of sand in a heap, and seldom form a united body outside the factory, except, perhaps, at public meetings. That which capitalism brings together to one spot in the large towns and centres of industry is but a shapeless mass of individuals, who have broken entirely with the past, who have become loosened from all old common bonds—from home, from village, from family—and who commence the new life without any of the ideals of the old. They cling only to the companions whose fate is like their own; who, as individuals, are of no value, and, like themselves, have no longer any tradition to look back upon. The two join hands; they become comrades; and in this way a crowd of comrades is formed, which is distinguished above all else, not by the special qualities of the individual, and not by a common tradition, but by the fact that it is an aggregation of units. Never in all history have so many individuals combined to form a united movement; never in all history was the solid phalanx of the masses so plainly the characteristic of a movement as in that of the proletariat. On all sides is heard the "onward march of the huge labour battalions," with which Lassalle tried to frighten his opponents. To picture the Social Movement of our day to the mind's eye we must imagine a huge wave of humanity, from which scarcely one individual stands out, covering the dry land to the distant horizon. Psychologically, this means that the individual becomes conscious of the enormous power which the masses may wield. The feeling of the modern proletarian as he recalls the fact that he is a member of his class is akin to that which in bygone times filled the breast of

the man who belonged to the nobility, to an honoured clan, to a great city or to a conquering State, and it is with pride that he declares his allegiance: *Proletarius sum*.

Side by side with this dissolution of all qualitative, or individually coloured, differences into the quantitative mass, and having influences in another direction, is the development of modern technical knowledge. Only when we know the special characteristics of this knowledge shall we be able to understand important aspects of the proletarian movement, more especially the tendency to communism.

The socialization of the process of production (by which I mean the increasing specialization and the greater necessity for co-operation in labour) has brought it about that each single commodity is no longer the product of the individual worker, but the result of the combined efforts of many. Formerly the shoemaker who made a pair of shoes was the sole maker of the article in question. The workman in a modern shoe factory, who has only to exercise himself in part of the production of a pair of shoes, has lost all personal relationship to the article as a whole. The process of production in the case of each single commodity is one on communist lines; and so it is an easy matter for the single workmen who combine to produce it to think of the communist organization of the whole of production. In the same way it is easy for the worker, especially if he lives in a city, to think of a common communist basis of consumption, seeing that his surroundings all point in that direction.

The single house, in which purely individualistic tendencies most easily unite, loses all its charm for the poor who live in large common tenements. They feel more and more at home in public places of entertainment, where they can satisfy their intellectual and material wants far better than in their homes. Trade-Union centres, public libraries, concert halls, cafés become new homes for the masses of our large cities. As public buildings, parks,

squares and museums are developed and extended, they are more and more used by the proletariat, especially as the attractions of their individual or family life tend to grow less. Indeed, the family itself breaks up because of the long hours of toil, either in the daytime or at night, outside the home, because of women having to work, and children to begin to work early in life in order to add to the family exchequer. Thus the proletariat is forced by outside influences to forsake their individual interests and merge them in those of the mass.

But to make our view of the modern Social Movement complete we must have regard to the general conditions of our age, amid which this movement is taking place. Here, too, we shall have to content ourselves with a few general remarks. Our age is characterized above all by an intensity of life such as I cannot conceive of any other age. Modern society simply pulsates with life. Much of this is due to the new means of communication which capitalism has created for us. The possibility of arranging business matters in a few hours, despite long distances, by means of the telegraph, or telephone, or newspapers; the possibility of carrying huge masses from place to place by means of the modern methods of transport has brought about a condition of things where a combination of large masses of people is a very simple matter indeed, and has produced within us a feeling, unknown to our grandfathers, of the smallness of space, especially in our large cities where great masses of people move about with ease. At the same time knowledge has increased among the masses, and with knowledge has come demands.

This intensity of life is accompanied by what may be called the nervousness of our time—the restlessness, the haste, the uncertainty of all forms of life. Because of our peculiar economic conditions, this restlessness has made its way into all branches not only of economic, but also of social activity. The age of free competition has brought competition into all walks of life; every one strives to

outvie his neighbour, no one rejoices in his portion, and contemplation and its peacefulness are gone for ever.

One other point must be noticed. I mean the revolutionary spirit which is abroad in our time, changing and recasting values in all directions. Everything is in flux—economic activities, science, art, morals, religion; all conceptions are in such an unsettled state that we are beginning to believe there is nothing fixed and everlasting. And here we have one of the most important facts for the explanation of modern social movements. It explains two things. First of all, it accounts for that destructive criticism of all that is established which finds no grain of good anywhere, which throws all former beliefs into the dust-heap and goes to market with new ones. This critical state of mind was already developed in the bourgeoisie; it has been applied to politics, morals, religion and art. The proletariat is only adopting it and applying it to economic and social institutions.

Secondly, the revolutionary spirit above mentioned makes possible the fanatic belief that any wished-for state of things may be achieved. When so much has changed, when such wonders in which no one ever dared to believe have come about before our very eyes, why should there not be more? Why should not all that can be wished for come about? In this way the revolutionary present becomes the feeder of the social Utopia of the future. Edison and Siemens are the spiritual fathers of Bellamy and Bebel.

Here, then, we have the elements out of which Socialism and the Social Movement are built up in our day. We have seen what the starting-point is: the capitalist economic system with the class relationship that exists between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. We have seen that to this relationship may be traced the origins of discontent and the longing for new conditions, the growth of a will in the proletarian masses, and the wish for emancipation. We have seen the conditions in which the proletarian class live, and from these conditions we have noted

not only that there is a tendency to revolt against things as they are, but also the direction in which this revolt is moving (the ideal of a communist organization of society, economically and socially, in which the interests of the masses shall receive their fair share of attention). I use the term proletariat to denote an independent social class striving for this economic system, which, since it has not yet arrived, is an ideal of the future—the economic system which, for the sake of simplicity, we call the Socialist system.

“Socialism and the Social Movement” is but the realization, or the attempts at the realization, of this future social state, which shall be more in accord with the needs of the proletariat.

Socialism seeks to bring this end about in the world of ideas, and the Social Movement in the sphere of practical politics.

All theoretical attempts to show the proletariat the goal of its efforts, to call upon it to take up the struggle, to organize the struggle, to show it the way along which it must march if it is to succeed—all this is what we understand by modern Socialism. And all practical attempts actually to carry out these ideas we call the Social Movement. Socialism and the Social Movement, therefore, are but two sides of the same phenomenon. Their relation to each other is that of thought and deed, of soul and body.

Our purpose in this book will be to show the growth of this two-sided phenomenon from its very beginning, and to discover the so-called laws of its development. We shall do so impartially, taking no sides in the march of facts before our eyes. We shall observe it all as a botanist observes a plant or a physician an illness—only as an interesting case.

Our aim is thus clearly marked out, and so we shall not attempt to weave into our study all sorts of useless side-issues. We shall keep strictly to the task before us. We shall not include in our considerations all the Socialist theories which have at any time arisen, nor all the Socialist

theories of our own day. Only those shall be noticed that have come to have some practical value; that is to say, those which have had some influence on the social changes with which we are concerned. Accordingly, it is not our province to notice Rodbertus any more than to concern ourselves with Carl Marlo or Düring or any number of others.

In the same way it is no concern of ours to pay any attention to movements for improving existing conditions which in these days are often spoken of as "social." I have been blamed for leaving these out of my survey. It has been suggested, for example, that I should have included the Land Reform Movement. I beg to differ. This book has a definite idea in view, and it must be limited to all that bears on the idea, and to nothing else. I might as well have included the Anti-Vaccination Movement, or the Food Reform Movement, or that of the Abolitionists, or of the Housing Reformers, or indeed of any other group of reformers. All these, however, are beyond my scope here. Only those movements which are brought about by the proletariat are of interest to us in this book, and even not all of these, but only such as attempt to replace the Capitalist by the Socialist organization of society. All other Proletarian Movements, which aim at improving the condition of the working classes within the prevailing capitalist order, will be noticed only in so far as they touch, or support, that other great Social Movement.

What I mean by this will become clearer as we go along.

PART ONE

SOCIALISM

CHAPTER I

THE UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES OF MODERN SOCIALISM

EVER since the middle of the eighteenth century the Capitalist system has been quickly developing new characteristics, and side by side with it a new social literature has been growing in which the mighty changes are reflected in all their manifold variety. The prevailing literature at the beginning of the period was that which we have accustomed ourselves to call "classical political economy," the best scientific presentation of which was to be found in the works of Quesnay, Adam Smith, Malthus, and David Ricardo. These men took up a naïve position with regard to Capitalism. Their aim was to explain Capitalism; yet at the same time, and above all else, they sought to win men over to recognize it as the higher form of economic organization.

The newer literature which developed in opposition to the prevailing doctrines has one common characteristic, and that is opposition to Capitalism. Just as it opposed the prevailing theory, which was a sort of apologetics of Capitalism, so also it ranged itself against the prevailing economic organization. This position was a consequence of the immaturity of economic thought at the time.

The new literature expressed this opposition in a curious mixture of explanations and demands, of considerations of things as they were and as they ought to be. All literature which is undeveloped commences in this fashion, in the same way as untrained minds distinguish but slowly between the world as it is, and some ideal world that ought to be. Moreover, in this new literature, practical questions—as might be expected—received most attention; and

there was a desire to give a scientific basis to new demands and fresh ideals.

In order, therefore, to obtain a clear conception of this literature with all its different shades of opinion, we must observe how the expected new ideals are regarded. If we do so, we shall find two distinct groups of writings; the one may be called "Reform" literature, the other "Revolutionary"—this last term being used in a special sense which I shall make clear before long. The "Reform" literature recognizes the existing Capitalist system, and with that as a basis seeks to introduce changes and improvements in one of two ways. Either it recommends small unimportant reforms in the existing economic organization of society, leaving fundamentals as they are; or, what is more frequently the case, it concurs in existing social conditions, but desires a change in the thoughts and feelings of men. It preaches repentance; it asks for a new spirit and calls for the exercise of all the good qualities in the human breast—of brotherly love, of charity, and of forgiveness.

This wish for reform which admits the evils of the social organism, but which nevertheless holds fast to the prevailing economic system, seeking to lessen these evils within the framework of that system, has different starting-points. Either it is Christianity which produces this literature of social reform, or perhaps a purely ethical or philanthropic idea dominates it.

The application of Christian teaching to the social order has produced the tendency in economic literature, which we usually, though not quite appropriately, call "Christian Socialism." This is expressed in the writings of Lamennais in France and of Kingsley in England, both of whom were filled with the Biblical spirit, and called on masters and men alike to remove the influence of mammon out of their souls, to fill their hearts with the spirit of the gospel—the new spirit, as they both constantly call it. Very similar to this is the tone of those early ethical economists, Sismondi and Thomas Carlyle, who never tire

of preaching, not so much the Christian is the social spirit. For them, the only solution is an inner change, which shall recognize a higher duty. Lastly, the third tendency, which I have called philanthropic, appeals more to the feelings than to either religion or duty. There were men and women in those days whose hearts were filled with a mighty humanitarian spirit, who believed that with that they could heal the evils around them. They yearned to drown the misery they saw in a flood of human kindness. "Love each other as men, as brothers," was the burden of their cry.

All these tendencies whose origins we have here described have continued down to our own days. They all have this in common: that they accept the prevailing economic order as a matter of principle. I have, therefore, described the literature which gives expression to them, as Reform literature. Opposed to this, there is another which I have called Revolutionary, because, as a matter of principle, it would like to remove and change the Capitalist economic organization. It would like to do so in two different directions—backward (if I may so express it) on the one hand, and forward on the other.

When the economic differences first showed themselves, and in consequence an anti-Capitalistic literature arose, no small part of it advocated that the Capitalist organization of society should be replaced by the organization which had preceded it. I am thinking of the writings of Adam Müller and Leopold von Haller in the first third of the nineteenth century. Men like these desired to see the medieval feudal system with its Craft guilds take the place of the Capitalist system. This point of view may still be met with, though in no wise so clearly and forcibly expressed as when it first appeared.

Beside this reactionary literature, there is yet another, revolutionary and progressive: the Socialist literature; and it is that which is of interest to us here. It is revolutionary, because it demands a change in the present economic organization of society. It is progressive, be-

cause it is not content to hark back to a social organization of the past; it demands that a new social order should be built up. It is socialistic, because it makes this demand in the interests of the wage-earning class, or the proletariat.

Now it may be asked whether there is some characteristic, some family likeness, common to all the works in the vast literature of modern Socialism. The answer is distinctly in the affirmative. It would be strange if it were otherwise. For the elements out of which all modern systems of Socialism are composed are for the most part the same; certainly in the case of those which have the practical value discussed in the introduction, and therefore which have their roots in the masses, and in which the masses believe: in a word, those which have pointed to the way along which the proletarian movement must march.

When we speak of modern Socialism, we must not overlook the fact that in each of its presentations there is more than an economic or social programme: there is a whole view of life. The doctrines of the Socialist teachers give the masses all that before was given them by their pastors and masters. In this combination of political and economic aspirations with a metaphysical view of life an explanation may be found for the dogmatic fanaticism and the deep-rooted faith with which Socialism is so often explained. And where Christianity has not yet been replaced by advanced thought (as in England and North America), Christian belief is made part of the Socialistic idea, and the teaching of Christ is used in the interests of Socialism. Indeed, it is often said that Christ was the first Socialist.

It appears to me that the view of life which is preached in all systems of Socialism, or which is apparent between the lines even where not directly mentioned, has distinct features of its own. We meet with a childlike, naïve determination to live, a longing and calling for happiness, for joy, for freedom, and we hear these rising above the

lamentations on the evils of our present social system. That was only to be expected of a youthful social class, just awakening to the charms of life. The motto which Weitling¹ chose for his book, *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit* (Guarantees of Harmony and Freedom) may be adopted as that of all modern Socialistic writings: "We want to be as free as the birds of the air; we want to go through life in joyful bands, just as they do, with never a thought of care." All the joys and pleasures which the poor, troubled soul of this journeyman tailor pictured to itself, and which he wrote down for his wretched companions that they might think of them in the hour of suffering and torment—all those joys and pleasures, primitive and simple as they were, have remained the hope of the care-laden and poverty-stricken masses even to this day. The holiest right is the right to live, to live in happiness, to enjoy the good things of life. "Socialism takes its stand on the positive rights of life and of all the pleasures of life, intellectual, moral and physical. Socialism loves life and wants to taste of it in full measure. . . . It never asserts that the life of man must of necessity be a sacrifice or that death is a blessing." That is how Bakunin puts it; that is the gospel which Fourier was the first to preach; and the words are re-echoed in the writings of present-day Socialists like Bebel and Jaurès. The doctoral dissertation of the great French agitator was entitled *De la réalité du monde sensible* (On the reality of the material world), and the keynote of this treatise is an enthusiastic pæan in praise of all enjoyment. It has justly been called "un hymne de bonheur"—a hymn of happiness, for it overflows with the joy of life and is optimistic through and through. The prophets of the movement lead their people, as yet only in imagination, from the wilderness of every-day existence into the promised land of bliss of which they have so long dreamed, into a band

¹ William Weitling, born in Magdeburg on October 5, 1808, died in New York January 15, 1871, commenced life as a journeyman tailor and eventually became a communist writer and agitator. The book mentioned in the text was published in 1842.

which lies beyond the purgatory of Capitalism. Everything that any Socialist preacher ever sought to proclaim to the believing masses is included in those fine verses of Heine's, which in reality contain the essence of the Socialist gospel of happiness—

"A new song, a sweeter song,
O friends, let me sing you :
We want to set up here on earth
The heaven for which we hope.

We want to be happy here on earth,
And not to hunger more ;
The idle belly shall no longer live
On that which busy hands create.

There is bread in plenty here on earth
For every human creature ;
There are roses and myrtles, beauty and joy
And sweet peas, too, in plenty."¹

Beside sentiments like these, the sad tones of the author of the *Kreuzersonate* are lost in the wind. They may perhaps attract a few discontented and weary souls to rally round the author; the masses of the proletariat will remain deaf to their call. As I said before, it is only what we should expect of a youthful social class awakening to life in this worldly age.

Naturally this demand to set up the kingdom of heaven on earth takes different forms. To-day, for example, the cry is that all men without exception shall participate in the blessings of civilization. But whether in this form or in another, the idea remains the same.

Heine's poem, however, contains one new thought on which modern Socialism lays as much stress as on universal happiness.

"The idle belly shall no longer live
On that which busy hands create."

I am certain that in every system of Socialism the "gospel of work," as it is here expressed, receives promi-

¹ The original is in rhymed metre. But I have thought it best to give a faithful prose rendering rather than a rhymed paraphrase which may perhaps depart too much from the original. Our aim here is to get as near as possible to Heine's meaning.

ence. It is not too much to say that the glorification of labour is the central point in all Socialist ethics, and that discussions on the organization of labour, on the relation between labour and production, between labour and profit, between labour and enjoyment form the kernel of all Socialist theories. The world of the future will be a world of work, where the most widely accepted principle shall be: "He who does not work shall not eat." On this all Socialists are agreed.

We are not surprised that this is so. When people in the lowest social strata on whom the curse of the most disagreeable work rests (and it is of manual labour, more especially of the lowest kind, that the Socialist thinks in the first instance)—when people such as these dream of an ideal state, it will hardly be one in which life is all play and no work. Work there must be, if the necessities of man are to be produced; the Socialist thinkers want only to shorten its duration by more equal distribution. One holds that three hours is the required length of the working day; another maintains that two hours will suffice; a third believes that the time will be even less. But if work is a necessity, no one shall be exempt from it. For if there are exceptions, it would mean that those who do work will have to contribute more than their share to the common stock. Besides, on what principle are the exceptions to be justified?

If the first recognition, then, is that work is a necessity, and that no one is to be exempted from it, the second follows quite naturally: work is noble. For work is the one thing that all individuals, even the least significant, have in common; it is the one thing (looked at quantitatively as a certain result produced in a certain time) in which all individual differences disappear. It thus becomes the mark of the new and latest aristocracy which is to play a part in the history of mankind. There is in reality no other means of levelling humanity, and therefore no other means of distinguishing the individual, who is nothing more than a part of the whole and whose

importance consists only in helping to make up the whole, than by giving a certain sanctity to work as such—to the mere putting forth of muscular energy, quite apart from the result of such work. Only in death is there that same equality as in labour. But it is life that is wanted in the Socialist State. Accordingly the only ideal for the practical shaping of life is to be found in equality of labour alone.

It is clear, too, that in the State of the future the masses themselves will direct affairs in the way they think best. Every Socialist system which in these days has found favour with the proletariat has no other than this radical, democratic ideal. It goes beyond parliamentary government, even when that is based on universal equal suffrage; it desires for the masses the power of the Initiative and the machinery of the Referendum, in order that their will may find full and effective expression. Indeed, we may say that just as the parliamentary system, which is the free institution suited to the interests of the middle class, succeeded the absolutism of pre-Capitalist society, so in its turn this system will be succeeded by a larger political organization having the Socialist ideals of the proletariat. This is clear as soon as we are acquainted with the characteristic feeling of the proletariat. There is still in the parliamentary system a good deal of aristocracy; this shows itself in the rule of professional politicians, of the people who "know," who are, as it were, the augurs of the crowd. But that no longer satisfies the radical democracy in the proletariat, which insists on a direct participation of the sovereign people in all decisions on public questions. The highest aim of the proletariat is to cease being—what it has hitherto been in the State and in Society—the passive element, and become the active element, to cease being the object and to become the subject of legislation.

Now if Socialists were asked why it is that the ideal conditions of peace and justice for which they hope have not yet appeared on earth, or if they have once existed, why they have disappeared, they would reply that the organiza-

tion of Society has made it impossible. And here we touch upon another idea underlying all Socialist thought—that the weal and the woe of mankind depend to a very large extent on the outward organization in which men live. Robert Owen more than any other preached this doctrine and made it the backbone of his system. Indeed, Owen is the originator of the modern theory of environment; the motto of all his writings is, "The character of man is formed *for* him and not *by* him." The idea is repeated again and again in all his works, taking a thousand different forms. Man becomes what he is because of the surroundings in which he grows up; he is dependent on "the influences of circumstances." And because these are so imperfect, happiness and harmony have not yet appeared on earth. Therefore, all we have to do is to create a new order, new surroundings, new "circumstances," and all will be well. This idea of Owen's has come down as a legacy to all later Socialist teaching; it may be seen to-day in the general social optimism which believes in a "good" social order.

If all Socialist theories agree in this, they also agree in their location of the evils of the present social organization. They see them in the two fundamental facts on which that social organization is built up—in free competition with its accompanying race for profit, and in private property.

The race for profit is embodied in money, and this is why the older expositors of Socialism are full of fiery condemnations of money and of mammon. There is a touching expression of this idea, as of many others which underlie the whole Socialist structure, in the childlike language of the poor tailor of Magdeburg.¹ "At that time" (*i. e.* when the evil influence of gold will have been recognized and all money will be no more), "at that time the tear-drops which tell of mutual love will again return to the dry eyes of selfishness; the heart of evil-doers will be filled with virtuous sentiments unknown to them before,

¹ Weitling: *Garantien*, p. 57.

and those who denied God will join their voices in a prayer of thanksgiving to Heaven. Happy are they who live to see that day. In the annals of universal history there will be no other like it, for it will be the day of Faith (!) and Forgiveness. . . . Man will be changed in his nature and society will be born anew."

"Forward, brothers! With the curse of manna on our lives let us await the hour of freedom which will turn our tears into drops of dew, which will transform the earth into a paradise and make mankind one family."

For one reason or another private property is also regarded as one of the cankerworms of our evil economic and social system, and therefore all Socialist writers agree that in the new order there will be no private ownership of property; or, if it does exist, will exist only to a very limited degree. Private ownership as it exists to-day will, in the Socialist State, be transformed into common or communistic ownership (without a class of private Capitalist undertakers). This idea, too, is but a natural consequence of the whole train of thought. If it is desirable to abolish the Capitalist organization which gives to our social organism a hateful mastery, and if at the same time it is necessary to maintain production on a large scale—necessary in the interests of the millions of oppressed, whose advocate Socialism is—then there is one only way possible, and that is to let the masses control the extensive existing social and economic machinery. In other words, Production, and eventually Distribution and Consumption also, must be regulated on Communistic lines. We shall see how this cardinal principle of Socialist thought was first clearly enunciated by Karl Marx, though the Socialist writers who preceded him already had a dim notion of it. The principle is no mere product of a fanciful mind; it is the logical consequence of any attempt to explain theoretically the striving of the proletariat for emancipation; that is to say, it is the logical outcome of all Socialist theory.

The regulation of the ownership of property is so important a principle in Socialism that an attempt has been

made to describe Socialism (or Communism) in terms of ownership of property. It has been said that Socialism is that economic organization of society which admits of no private ownership of certain categories of commodities. Such a treatment of the subject may possibly be serviceable in text-books. But for our purpose it is useless. We are attempting to study one aspect of things as they are, and we must therefore regard Socialism as a living organism; we must understand it in its historical aspect as the intellectual expression of a certain Social Movement. From this point of view the regulation of the ownership of property is but one characteristic of many, and we regard it not as a dogmatic distinction but as a necessary growth in the development of the organism.

Our point of view will also guard us against accepting the characteristic differences which makers of text-books usually distinguish in the different Socialist systems according to their treatment of private property in the future state. To distinguish, for example, between Communism (which demands common ownership in all commodities) and Collectivism (which demands common ownership of the means of production only), or between centralized and confederated Socialism, is to leave untouched the very heart of this great intellectual movement. Distinctions such as these are of no importance in real life; they interest only the dogmatic economist. Moreover, it is by no means always easy to distinguish one system from another by differences of this kind. Communist Anarchism and Communist Socialism are as like as two eggs.

No. What does differentiate the various Socialist systems (whose common ideas we have already observed) is the different spirit which directs them—the constantly changing view of the flow of events, the valuation of Socialist ideals from the point of view of the philosophy of history. But these are closely bound up with the general philosophic tendencies of the age. In other words, Socialists have always been at one in their criticism of existing conditions, and also in what they considered

ought to be the aim of reforms. They differed only as to the way in which they hoped their ideals would be realized. Looked at from this point of view, the different Socialist systems may be divided as follows: (1) naïve, rational, Utopian Socialism, and (2) historic, realistic Socialism. The latter had two epochs, one dogmatic, the other critical. To discover the differences between these various Socialist systems we shall examine them in the order given.

CHAPTER II

RATIONAL SOCIALISM

I. THE OLDER (SO-CALLED "UTOPIAN") SOCIALISM

ALL the numerous Socialist systems which arose during the period extending from the end of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth have such a strong family likeness that it is clear they must be related and spring from one common source. That source was the social philosophy of the previous century, and it is responsible for the system of Godwin and Owen in England, of Fourier and Cabet (and to a large extent also of Proudhon) in France, and of Weitling in Germany—to name but a few of those who have contributed no small portion to the building up of Socialist theory. I shall try to show the common origin and the relationship of all these early systems by means of quotations from each.

All thinkers who up to the eighteen-forties were socialistically inclined based their views on the metaphysical belief in the goodness of God (or of Nature). God is good, and since He made the world, the world also is good. Any other conclusion would be absurd. It would be absurd, for instance, to imagine that a beneficent God should have created a world which was not filled with goodness and harmony. "All that God has made is good" (Fourier). Now, human society is a part of the world, and therefore the same laws prevail in it as in the rest of the universe. Accordingly, God must have made human society a realm of peace and harmony, where man should be happy. Man is good by nature; he is a social animal; he can develop to the highest grades of perfection. That is the gospel of the Utopists. "As God or

Nature has made all the qualities of humanity, they must be good and of necessity such as they are " (Owen). "Why doubt the goodness of God before we have discovered His purposes? To assert that men are incapable of reaching so high a degree of perfection [as Fourier proposes] is to accuse God of evil intentions. . . . If industry were intended to produce these scandalous results [which we observe], God would not have brought it into existence " (Fourier). "It is impossible to assume that the destiny of mankind on this earth is to be unhappy, and if we consider that man is essentially social in his nature, and therefore full of sympathy and affection for others, it is no longer possible to say that he is wicked by nature " (Cabet). The burden of Weitling is in the same strain : "Man, the child of God's love and of Nature's, must have enjoyed supreme happiness in primitive times in the delightful paradise that the world then was."

As a matter of fact, however, the Socialist thinkers saw only misery and suffering, conflicts and disagreements in the world around them; civilization had produced only "scandalous results," "troubles and disorders, vices and crimes, wars and revolutions " (Cabet). How are these things to be accounted for? Their answer was simple. Men have tampered with the perfect social machine which God created, so that it no longer works as it should. They have destroyed the natural harmony of the social organism and, in consequence, the happiness of each individual, by introducing all manner of artificial devices, such as private property and the like.

"The present imaginary notions . . . are in direct opposition to all these unerring and unchanging laws of Nature; and hence the irrationality and insanity of the past and present state of the human race " (Owen). "If these evils and vices are not produced by Nature we must seek other causes for them. And if we do, must we not admit that the causes lie in the faulty organization of society? " (Cabet).

There are, therefore, two kinds of social organizations—

one "natural," "the rational state of man's existence based on the unerring and unchanging laws of Nature" (Owen); the other artificial, and therefore unnatural, the condition of things as they appeared in history, and as they still continue to-day. It is clear that all those who love mankind must wish to bring back the "natural order" among them. To do this, however, the first requisite is to discover the reasons why this ideal condition has been impossible hitherto, and soon it becomes plain that man's shortsightedness is the cause. It was not sin that drove man from, or prevented him entering into, paradise; it was only error. "All governments, laws, institutions and customs, among all nations, have emanated from the same fundamental error . . . are false, and whatever is false is permanently injurious to man" (Owen).

All this leads to but one conclusion: we must seek truth. "Truth, which has been hitherto violently opposed by wild imaginations, can only serve man in his onward progress" (Owen). This is the central point in all rationalist thought. The best social organization in which men may reach the greatest happiness and perfection is a matter of knowledge and perception. All that is necessary is to discover the laws which underlie the "natural order." Once these are known there is nothing to prevent the appearance of harmony and happiness on earth. Our reason will lead us to the discovery, and so make a newer and better life possible. "Has not Nature endowed us with intelligence and reason with which to 'organize' happiness, society and equality?" (Cabet). And so the social order of the future will be "reasonable," no less than natural, for Reason it is that brings back man to his natural state.

It will not be very difficult to realize what boundless importance was attached to reason and to knowledge in those generations. The worship of Reason which was manifested in the French Revolution may be traced to the same source as the theories of the Rationalist Socialists,

with whose views we have just made ourselves acquainted. And if knowledge was important, the men of knowledge were no less so. They were regarded as priests of the goddess Reason, who were in a measure themselves divine, and into whose hands, wherever that were possible, the reins of social government were to be placed. Perhaps the most remarkable conception of this idea, which was common to all the Rationalists, is to be found in Weitling's book, where it is carried to its logical conclusion. "In the first place," he says, "I adopted the principle which is admitted as an axiom in the learned world that philosophy must bear rule. I then thought out the meaning of philosophy, and discovered that it stands for the sum-total of all knowledge. . . . What steps should be taken . . . to hand over the direction of the social order to knowledge?" Weitling advocates a kind of competitive examination. Men of learning were to be invited to apply for the position and to prove their fitness by sending in scientific dissertations. "The works thus sent shall be examined by the members of the learned academies, and the writer who is adjudged the best shall be appointed to that branch of government where his natural gifts may be of the greatest possible utility to society." He then goes on, "I should advocate the following arrangement for the government of societies. At their head would be placed a triumvirate composed of great philosophers who are at the same time the highest authorities respectively in the sciences of healing, of physics and of mechanics." Ideas such as these may be found in the greater part of the Socialist literature of those days. It was accepted as an axiom that social science must direct social practice, and that the two must go hand in hand. "Social science is in agreement with reason and with social practice" (Proudhon).

The age of which we are speaking had good cause for valuing reason and science so highly. It was then that those laws were discovered by which society should be governed—laws which were according to the will of God

or of Nature, and which previous ages had been too blind to see. The day is dawning, the sun of knowledge has arisen—that is the cry in all the writings of the time. "These dark clouds of mental night are breaking in all directions" (Owen). "Man has discovered the cause of his past imperfect, crude and miserable existence" (Owen). "At last we have discovered the mechanism of a higher social organization" (Fourier). "The knowledge of the new law in its complete significance has been perceived by some of us" (Proudhon).

It may be noted in passing that a generation before one or two brilliant minds had discovered that the capitalist organization of society, with free competition and private property, was the "natural" order of things. This was a principle for which the Physiocrats all stood. Men like the elder Mirabeau, Dupont Nemours, Quesnay and Turgot did not doubt for a moment that they had discovered the natural laws of human society, and that those laws were embodied in the system of free competition. The discovery of the "natural" order in the later age by the Utopian Socialists was, therefore, in reality nothing new. There was a difference, however, in the two conceptions of the "natural" order. The later thinkers did not see it in the capitalist system, but in a new system sanctioned by God and brought about by the influence of Reason. This belief made Socialists of the rationalist thinkers whom we have mentioned. For the new order which was their ideal contained those elements of a socialist society which were sketched in the last chapter. But while they were all agreed as to the principles of the new order, the form which it took with each of them was different, and the differences led them to say hard things of each other. Fourier speaks of the "moral fads" which Owen and his followers sought to realize, and Weitling thunders against Fourier in unmeasured terms. "Cursed folly, from which the disciples of Fourier cannot rid themselves though a thousand devils drove them. . . . So long as you abide by it we must go our different ways."

All this, however, is by the way. It has no great influence on that which lies at the root of the matter, and which is of interest to us at present. What is of no small importance, both in itself and because of its influence on the part that socialist theory plays in the actual world, is the conclusion drawn by the rationalist Socialists from their conception of society and of history (if indeed they included history in their intellectual outlook) as to making their ideas practical. In other words, we must know their tactics for bringing about the new order of which they dreamed. Since the changes in society are due to knowledge, what, above all, is necessary as soon as truth has been discovered is to preach the new gospel, to disseminate truth, and to spread knowledge. For as soon as a large number of people were in possession of this knowledge, the new ideas would at once take practical form, and the greatest possible happiness be achieved. It seemed quite inconceivable that any one with the requisite knowledge should refuse to change the old conditions for the new.

"The complete change which is necessary can hardly be thought of as something to be done. It is rather a vision which men will see. They need but to understand their condition, and their chains will disappear like shadows before the dawn. When the decisive hour strikes there will be no need to draw a sword or even move a finger. Our opponents will be too weak to withstand feelings common to all humanity" (Godwin). Furthermore, since all men at present suffer in consequence of the "irrational" conditions, all men will be ready to change them. Therefore the new doctrines must be preached to all men, and not merely to the oppressed and the poor. Indeed, the rich and the powerful ought to receive more attention, for if they are won over to the truth, its practical realization will be all the more speedy. "Must we not first convert the rich? Certainly; to commence with them is the best policy, for the rich and the educated will have great influence in converting others of

their class, and even the poor too. . . . But can we hope that the rich will be converted? Why doubt it? Are there not among the rich cultivated, just and generous men?" (Cabet). The same considerations are found in the works of all the earlier Socialists, and I have quoted Cabet because he was one of the last of these. But even Weitling in 1842 ends his *Guarantees of Harmony and Freedom* with an appeal to the "mighty ones of the earth." "You," he says, "have the means of winning greater fame than an Alexander or a Napoleon. You have the means of removing all the evils of society in a way that is agreeable both to you and to us [here we already have a voice from the masses!]. If we are forced to undertake the work in our own rough and ready way, it will be a weary and painful process both for us and for you. Consider, therefore, and choose!"

The spirit of dissatisfaction makes itself heard in this passage. It is the last warning, the last attempt to win over the opponents, before the new ideas are allowed to take their natural course.

Voice and pen were to be the means for the propagation of the new gospel. "To work then, to work, all you, rich and poor, who have been converted to the *Communauté* [that was Cabet's scheme of salvation]. Discuss, preach, convert, propagate! Collect all manner of opinions and proofs which may facilitate the conversion of others. . . . Go on preaching until the masses accept the principle of the *Communauté*" (Cabet).

But though he preached this policy, Cabet did not practise it. Most of the other representatives of older Socialism did, however, attach much importance to propaganda. They held that the influence of example could not but convince even the most stupid of the fact that their ideas were bound to succeed. Hence we find that it is one of the characteristics of the older socialist systems that they sought to establish settlements on a communist basis. America was usually chosen for this purpose, and there hundreds of "communities" of the followers of

either Fourier, or Owen, or Cabet arose only to disappear immediately.

One result of the adoption of this principle of making proselytes was that violent means for bringing about the new conditions were tabooed. "Let us anxiously refrain from violence: force is not conviction, and is extremely unworthy of the cause of justice" (Godwin). "Let us not harbour feelings of scorn, of bitterness, of anger, or of revenge in our hearts. The cause of justice is the cause of humanity. Its representatives, therefore, should be full of good-will. We must love the cause, seeing that it leads to the general happiness of mankind. We must love it because there is no man alive who would not be the happier for the success of our ideas."

Such a point of view made rational Socialism incompatible with political action. Again and again is this thought met with: How can a movement which was to show its highest possibilities by teaching, or, at best, by example, hope to gain anything in the struggle of parties? For the same reason it had little sympathy with the Trade-Union movement. Robert Owen did, indeed, found trade-unions, but their aim was not to oppose the employing class, but to propagate his ideas.

In describing the older Socialism I used a new term when I spoke of it as "Rationalistic." I did so of set purpose because this term, I believe, most adequately describes the spirit which animated the older Socialism, because it draws attention to vital characteristics, and not to the points which are only of minor importance. I ought to add that this school of writers is now commonly described by another term, a term which I myself used to use. They are called Utopists. But while the term Utopist does not convey a wrong impression, it seems to me to lay stress not on the positive, but rather on the negative side of their teaching, and for this reason I have discarded it. But I must not omit to sketch the Utopian aspects of those theories.

All the older Socialists were Utopists because they mis-

took the real motive force in the life of society. We saw how the belief in education and in the power of the knowledge of what is good is the dominating idea in all their teaching. In this surely they were Utopists. For they regarded as motive forces influences which are of no great moment in the world of realities, least of all in the life of society. Their belief is founded on two cardinal errors. On the one hand they have a wrong conception of the present and of the past, and on the other they are wholly mistaken in their expectations of the future. Their conception of the present and of the past is wrong in that it assumes that existing circumstances are due to error, that mankind is in its present state and the world full of misery only because people did not know better. The Utopists in their simplicity overlooked the fact that there are sections in every society who regard the existing conditions as perfectly satisfactory, and have no desire to change them; that indeed it is to the interest of people such as these to have existing conditions continue. They also overlooked the other fact that particular social conditions prevail because those people whose interests are paramount have the power of keeping conditions unaltered. In other words, they did not see that all social conditions are the expression of the prevailing division of power among the different classes of society. And to think that the possessors of power would be prevailed upon by preaching to give up their position, was hopelessly to underrate their strength.

Just as the Utopists underrated the strength of their opponents, so they overrated their own influence and powers. They thus also became Utopists as far as the future is concerned. For they firmly believed that to bring about the new order, all that was necessary was to make up one's mind to it. They overrated the capabilities of the men who were to form the society of the future. They forgot, or they did not know, that to make the new social order possible, men and conditions would have to change by a slow process of development. They over-

looked the fact that new social conditions were not a problem of knowledge, but much more a problem of character.

We shall say nothing of the fantastic ideas to which the Utopists gave expression in their pictures of the future. Fourier, for example, expected that the world would abound in tame lions for the service of man, that the salt water of the ocean would be turned into sweet lemonade, and that men would be of greater stature than at present. Godwin, indeed, went so far as to talk of the immortality of the body. Of course, ideas such as these are harmless nonsense, to which people with vivid imaginations may give expression. They are not taken seriously. But the fundamental mistakes the Utopists made in their judgment of men and history are of distinct importance. We shall see the influence of these mistakes in a true light when we consider the new socialist doctrines which, while drawing strength from the theories of the Utopists, yet consciously developed in direct opposition to some of their most important conceptions—I mean the doctrines of historic, or realistic, Socialism.

But before I proceed to give an account of these I wish to point out that the old, rationalist Socialism has in no wise disappeared. I am not thinking of remnants which may be found in the different systems of modern Socialism, especially in that of Karl Marx—we shall deal with these in their proper place—but rather of those theorists who in their thoughts and feelings still stand on rationalist and Utopian ground. I mean the people whom we have become accustomed to call Anarchists.

II. ANARCHISM

I believe that the true way of regarding Anarchism is to look upon it as the direct offspring of the rationalist philosophy of the eighteenth century. While it has extended its horizon by including many ideas which are

characteristic of the nineteenth century, the broad basis of its fabric may be traced to the rationalist thinkers, and more especially to Utopists like Godwin and Fourier. A glance into the literature of Anarchism makes this perfectly plain.

We find the same staunch belief in the "natural" order of society, and in "natural" social laws which must be discovered—"the general laws of the social economy which have been discovered, or which are to be discovered by the aid of science" (Bakunin)—in order that the realm of harmony might become a reality. "If society were established on a natural basis, the interests of the whole and those of the individual would never clash" (Jean Grave). "The desired harmony would come about of itself out of the solidarity of interests if all men were members of one and the same family" (Krapotkin). There is no doubt that if mankind were to organize itself in a "natural way"—"on this principle, as simple as it is sublime" (Krapotkin)—that is, on a system of mutual help, it would reach a state of perfection beyond its fondest expectations, and with this supreme happiness. As Fourier had foretold, even work would become "a pleasant pastime," "an exercise in gymnastics" (Jean Grave).

In the same way the Anarchists hold that if Harmony and Happiness are not universally found, it is entirely due to the wrong organization of all societies that have hitherto existed. This idea the Anarchists have taken up and developed. They see the embodiment of all the evils of society in the State. "The State is the root of the evil" (Bakunin). The State prevents the natural relationship between man and man because it is something artificial, something made by man's hand. The natural state of society is not one in which all manner of restraints exist, but one which is based on the natural law of mutual attraction, of what Fourier called "the attraction of the feelings." "Society does not impose itself formally, officially, authoritatively, but only naturally" (Bakunin). "Sociological laws must not be imposed from without;

their object must be, by teaching and not by coercion, to point out the most desirable environment in which the individual may develop his powers to the fullest extent" (Jean Grave).

The logical conclusion of all this for the Anarchists, as for the Utopian Socialists, is that the only way of bringing about a new organization of society is by spreading knowledge. Accordingly they attach great importance to knowledge and glorify Reason, by the light of which man should direct his actions.

John Henry Mackay gives expression to this view in his book, *The Anarchists*, when he speaks of his hero in these terms: "He was the precursor of dawn. After the long night of error and misconception came the morning with its glorious light. The sun of knowledge arose before his view and gradually reached its zenith. Thousands of years had to pass before the idea of Anarchism awoke. . . . The world had now found the truth." Similarly Peter Krapotkin, in his *Petit Catéchisme*, asks, "What was hitherto the greatest deed of the Revolution?" and he replies, "The decree of the National Convention of the 10th of May, 1793, which established the cult of Reason."

The "triumphs" of natural science about the middle of the nineteenth century only increased the reverence for knowledge among Anarchists. Their thought on more points than one was influenced by the philosophic materialism which established itself on scientific facts.

Finally, like the rational Socialists of the previous age, the Anarchists have a great belief in the power of propaganda. And for the same reason. They, too, desire to spread the truth which should bring happiness to all men. Their means are those of the Rationalists; they attempt to influence the masses by voice and pen and by the force of example. "Anarchists . . . devote . . . all their powers to the propagation of teaching, especially of economic teaching" (Tucker), and they do so on the platform and in the press.

All this may do much, but example will do more. "If in any large town in which the manifold characteristics and the opposing tendencies of our civilization are seen, a sufficient number of earnest and far-seeing Anarchists of all classes combined and organized the production and distribution of commodities on the principle of giving to each man what he produced; if, further, they established a bank which supplied them with money without charging interest, and which put its capital as it increased into new undertakings; and if, lastly, the advantages of this scheme were open to all who wished to participate in them—if all this happened, what would be the result? Clearly this—that very soon all classes of the population, the wise and the foolish, the good and the bad and the indifferent, would have their attention drawn to the new scheme, and more and more would participate in it, so much so that in a few years' time every man would reap the fruits of his labour, no one would be able any longer to live an idle life on the interest of his capital, and the whole town would become as busy as a hive, full of Anarchist workers, all of them free, all of them successful" (Tucker). It is the old tune once more, the tune which has not even yet entirely ceased to be heard. Society is sick; an effective cure must be found for it. But the social doctors are to-day no more agreed as to which is the only right course than they were a hundred years ago.

• It is exceedingly interesting to observe what an influence the strong desire for propaganda has on restless temperaments, which are impatient of development. It shows itself in a new and desperate course of action—in propaganda by deed. This new method, as is known, was first recommended, and put into practice, by a Russian, Netschajew by name; it was then developed by Paul Brousse and others, and adopted into the anarchist system. "Deeds," says Brousse in describing the method, "deeds are everywhere discussed; even the masses are roused by them out of their indifference, and they seek

for the causes which bring them about. The new doctrines receive attention and are discussed. When men have reached this stage, it is no difficult matter to win them over entirely." The deeds, however, are often misdeeds, either political or quite ordinary ones; all that is necessary is that they shall attract an enormous amount of attention. You throw a bomb into a café where a hundred harmless people are sitting at their ease, or you murder the Empress Elizabeth, an old lady who never harmed a living soul. In fact, the more senseless the "deed" the better, for then it will receive all the more consideration in every newspaper, and in every place where men foregather. The cause will thus be served, and that is the main intention. "Propaganda by deed" does not in the first instance aim at the "death of tyrants"; that is only by the way. Its great purpose is to bring the truth home to the masses by speedy means. It has no patience with the long and weary way of agitation in the press or on the public platform. The new gospel is a late, but direct, offspring of the Rationalism which we have already examined, with its dreams of a "right" social organization—right because it is in agreement with nature and reason.

But if propaganda by deed does not, as such, aim at the death of tyrants, it aims still less at bringing about new forms of government. The part which force has played in history is too big a subject to treat of here. But we must mention the fact that force may be resorted to for many reasons, and that its adoption may find a place in many views of life. Political force has often enough in the history of the world been adopted by the most practical statesmen; we need but instance Cromwell and Bismarck. We shall therefore not be surprised to learn that it still has its place as part of those socialist systems which have been called realistic, and which we shall discuss later on. For the present we are concerned only with showing what relation there is between rational, idealistic Socialism and the resort to violence. We saw

that the older Socialists abhorred all force. They have many followers in modern Anarchism (which is really the rational Socialism of our own day) who set their face against the practice. Nevertheless, it has been able, as we saw, to smuggle itself into the Anarchist system in the shape of the gospel of "propaganda by deed."

But force is advocated by many Anarchists, not merely in order to spread the doctrines of Anarchism, but rather to bring about by its aid the new and better social order. Krapotkin, Bakunin and Grave are the best known of this school.

It may at once be asked, is not this view in direct contradiction to the fundamental belief of Anarchists? If the new social order is to be in accordance with nature, and if enlightened minds will adopt it as soon as they realize its excellence and desirability, why advocate resort to force?

The answer is that the old idealistic Socialism has been partly influenced by the realistic spirit. It is a modern notion to which Jean Grave gives expression when he writes, "Conflict is unavoidable between those who want to emancipate themselves and those who want to continue their supremacy for ever." This could not have been written by a Godwin, a Fourier, or a Cabet.

I believe that the gospel of violence has been given that importance in the anarchistic system which is in accord with the whole structure of Rationalism. To understand this, let us recall that the idea of force to bring about revolutions, not, indeed, in the social sphere, but certainly in the political, was preached by the man who is regarded as the purest type of the older Rationalism, the man who was responsible for the decree, already mentioned, of the 10th of May, 1793, and who was one of the firmest believers in a natural social order based on Reason. I mean Robespierre. He was all this, and he was also the father of the Reign of Terror. He himself has shown us how one can be an apostle of Rousseau and a Terrorist at one and the same time. "People assert," he says, "that the

Reign of Terror is the weapon of despotism. As well say that the axe in the hands of the heroic leader in the cause of freedom has any likeness to that used by the common executioner in the service of a tyrant. No. The Government of the Revolution is a despotism if you like, but it is the despotism of liberty opposing tyranny." His meaning is clear. Those who have possessed power hitherto must be removed by force in order that freedom, justice and reason may take their place. Violence, then, is but the means of hastening the transition from tyranny to freedom. The same thought is found in the theory of Anarchists to-day. "All that we expect from force," says Jean Grave, "is that it should remove all obstacles out of the way."

We shall see how this same idea is entertained by a man who is usually regarded as the representative of a point of view fundamentally opposed to the old rationalistic view, a man who was one of the originators of "realistic" or "historic" Socialism: by no other than Karl Marx, who called it the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." It is to him that we now turn our attention.

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDATION OF HISTORICAL SOCIALISM

EVER since the beginning of the nineteenth century a change has been gradually showing itself in the fundamental conception of the State and of society, and in the way history is regarded. The rationalistic conception has been succeeded by an historic or realistic conception. Not that this was something entirely new. There had already been thinkers who entertained that particular point of view; we need only mention Harrington and Burke, Montesquieu and Vico. But it was towards the end of the eighteenth century that this point of view became the general and prevailing one. The new standpoint was connected with the great political changes which followed on the French Revolution. The revolt against the rationalistic conception of the State and of society first proceeded from those who occupied a reactionary political standpoint—from the opponents of Liberalism. As De Bonald, one of the founders of the new theories, put it: these men began "a counter-revolution in the scientific world." The political and social philosophers did not long stand alone; they were very soon joined by historians and lawyers, by philologists and geographers, men like De Bonald and Le Maistre, Thierry and Guizot in France; von Haller and Zachariä, Savigny and Niebuhr, Schlegel and Schleiermacher in Germany (to name but the best known among them), and together they put the intellectual and spiritual outlook of the time on a new basis.

What was the leading feature in the position of this new generation of thinkers? Wherein lay the change (and this is what is of interest to us here) in their conception of the State, of society and of history?

The new tendencies took their starting-point in the criticism of political constitutions. It was insisted on that the constitution of any State was not a creation of pure reason; and therefore could not have been constructed by any set of reformers according to their inclinations. It was rather the expression of the existing distribution of power in the State; or, if it was not this, it tended to become unreal or only nominal. In other words, the constitution of a people arose naturally in the course of its development. This conclusion had drawn attention to the close bonds between the political constitution of a people and its general social condition. Very soon the criticism of the political constitutions developed into a new theory of the State and of society, the salient doctrines of which may be expressed as follows :

There is no natural state of society as distinct from the one existing; there is no *ordre naturelle*; the existing state of things is as natural as any other and as reasonable. It may not perhaps be the best possible, but neither is it the worst. It is in reality the only possible condition of things in a given period, and therefore it is necessary.

The idea was put into philosophical language by Hegel, the greatest intellect of the time. "All that exists," he said, "is in accordance with Reason." The new views occupied an important place in Hegel's philosophical system and he was at pains to explain them at some length.

The existing organization of the State and of society, it was said, is the resultant of the combination of all the influences which affect the life of the State and of society. In the words of Schleiermacher, "Law is the expression of existing conditions." It is in accord with the objective conditions of the soil, of technical knowledge and so forth (what Guizot called "the material conditions of existence"), no less than with the subjective conditions of the stage of civilization and culture which the people living under it have attained at any given time in any given land. It is the resultant not of error but of the clear and

distinct interests of those elements which possess power in the State. History is therefore not a collection of disconnected accidents, but a natural succession of changes in the distribution of power which results from the constant struggle of opposing interests. To quote Guizot again, "The struggles of class against class form the contents of modern history." Or, as he says elsewhere, "Modern Europe arose out of the struggles of the different classes against each other."

Holding these views, the thinkers of the time could take up but one standpoint with regard to all reforms and revolutions and to all changes in the existing conditions. All new forms in the life of the State and of society could, in their view, come about only by growing out of the present; new social arrangements could have a meaning and could exist only in so far as they were in accord with the conditions of their time and place.

The practical result arrived at by the great majority of those who speculated on the nature of the State and of society was either that Liberal constitutionalism as it existed was the right political organization for present and for future times; or, that the Liberal ideas were already unreal and played out and positively harmful to the best interests of nations, and that therefore the sooner they were swept away, the better. The new social philosophy was made to support either conservative or reactionary politics.

•What is of interest to us in all this—it is indeed the reason why I have given this general sketch of the system—is that very soon the new conception of history was applied to the social struggles of the time. It was adopted by people who did not desire to keep things as they were or to make them what they had been. Their wish was for development, and those who advocated this policy were no other than the Socialists. By doing so they brought it about that Socialism entered on a new stage of history. Just as Socialism had previously taken its theories from the rationalistic social philosophy of the eighteenth cen-

ture, so now it was being slowly filled with the spirit of the modern historical and realistic school, and rational Socialism developed into historic or realistic Socialism.

We are not greatly concerned here to note the slow growth of socialist theories; we only want to know what they were. And therefore my intention is not to give an historical account of how modern Socialism became what it did. I will only mention that in my opinion by far the greatest influence on its growth was due to the Frenchman, Louis Blanc (though Engels calls him "the most insignificant of all the Socialists") and to the German, Lorenz von Stein. The latter, while not a practical Socialist, was nevertheless a theorist of the first order.

To understand the special characteristics of the new Socialism it will suffice us completely if we make ourselves acquainted with the system of the Socialist in whose teaching all the tendencies of the time combined, whose views were adopted by the whole of the next generation of Socialists, and who stamped the older doctrines with his personality to such a degree that they took a distinctive shape in his system. I mean, of course, Karl Marx.

Karl Marx was born in Treves in the year 1818 of Jewish parents who were later baptized. His father was a lawyer by profession, and the home where little Karl grew up was a centre of knowledge and culture. The authors most read in the family circle were Voltaire and Shakespeare, and the latter became the life-long favourite of Marx. It is worthy of note that an international tone prevailed in the family. His mother was more Dutch than German, and her closest friends were the von Westphalens, the parents of Baron Edgar von Westphalen, afterwards a Prussian minister of State, and of his sister Jenny. The former, of semi-Scottish descent, was a man of great culture, and it was to him that Karl Marx owed his first introduction to the best writers; the latter eventually became Karl Marx's wife. English and French were both very often spoken in the family circle.

Karl became a student at Bonn, and read philosophy and

history with the intention of qualifying for a professorship. In 1842 he was on the point of entering on the first stage¹ of this career, but there were difficulties in the way. The young man, who was at that time in close touch with Bruno Bauer, was swept away by the reactionary wave which was just then once again devastating the Prussian universities, more especially Bonn with its heterodox atmosphere. As most frequently happens when a young man is forced to leave the profession of his choice, Karl Marx went into journalism. Soon he became an exile, for in 1844 the Prussian police forced him to leave Germany. He fled to Paris. But from there also, owing, it has been suggested, to Prussian influence, he was expelled by the ministry of Guizot. In 1845 we find him in Brussels; three years later he is once more in Germany, but only for a little while; and in 1849 he found in London peace from police persecution. He lived there until his death in 1883.

Marx's personality was distinguished in large measure by a great power of thought, the characteristic features of which became only more marked by reason of the outward circumstances of his life. He was an unsparing, clear-sighted critic. He was thus able to perceive cause and effect in psychological and historical experience, more especially in those cases where that experience was shaped by the lower, and not the higher, qualities of men. There is a sentence by Pierre Leroux which seems to me to describe Marx admirably: "He had a special faculty for seeing the evil side in human nature," and, it may be added, for all manner of weaknesses. Thus naturally constituted, he readily believed Hegel's assertion that it is the Spirit of Evil which brings about development in the history of mankind. Indeed his whole view of life may be expressed in these lines—

"The earth belongs to the Spirit of Evil, and not
To the Spirit of Good. What the gods send us
From above are things which may be used by all alike.
Their light makes glad the heart, but it does not make man rich;
In their estate no one can win possessions for himself."

¹ Cf. note on p. 8.

There was reason enough why Karl Marx was able to rank so high among the social philosophers of the nineteenth century and to exercise, by the side of Hegel and Darwin, so great an influence on the thought of our day. He combined within himself the best philosophy of history current in his time with the knowledge of the highest forms of social life. He knew his Hegel and he knew western Europe, more especially France and England. He gathered all the lines of thought that had proceeded from thinkers of previous ages, and was clever enough, perhaps because of his international experience, to pay but little heed to what was accidental in national development and to lay stress on what was typical and general in the life of society to-day.

In conjunction with his friend Frederick Engels, Marx laid down the principles of a comprehensive system of social philosophy in a series of books, the best known of which is his *Capital*. This is not the place to go into all the details of his system. It is only the Marxian theory of the Social Movement that is of interest to us here, because by means of that theory Marx influenced the whole trend of social development. The theory cannot be found in its completeness in any one of his works, but its vital elements are contained in the *Communist Manifesto* which Marx and Engels put forward in 1847 as the programme of the "Union of the Just" in Brussels. The Union accepted it and became in consequence "The Union of the Communists."

The *Communist Manifesto* contains the outlines of a philosophy of history on which the programme of a party is based. It is a unique document in the literature of the world. Full of mistakes and of immature thought, it still remains an unequalled masterpiece of convincing eloquence. It has a large fund of ideas almost too brilliant to be real, and this is all the more remarkable, seeing that the authors were both young men in their twenties. Some of its observations are characterized by a fine illuminating wisdom. It has even been said that the substance of the

theory of modern society is contained in the *Communist Manifesto*. To a certain extent this is true. Only it must be remembered that the points are given briefly, and that the whole is but a broad outline. Nevertheless, though a man devote many years to the study of social theory, he will continue to find new, unexpected and striking truths in the *Communist Manifesto*. Marx and Engels in their later writings only developed the thoughts which this, their youthful effort, expressed.

What are the leading ideas in the *Communist Manifesto*?

All history, it asserts, is the history of class conflicts; and the history of to-day is the history of the conflict between the bourgeoisie or middle class and the proletariat. Classes are formed as a result of certain economic conditions of production and distribution, and these same conditions also regulate the distribution of power in a community. "Immanent" forces (the term is not used in the *Communist Manifesto*, but is quite common in the later writings) bring about changes in the conditions of production and, as a consequence, in all economic conditions.

Now economic changes are expressed most clearly in class opposition and class conflicts. In our own day the old declining economic system is represented by the bourgeoisie; the new system at present in the process of growth by the proletariat. The modern Social Movement, that is, the movement of the proletariat, is therefore nothing else than the organization of those elements of Society which are destined to break the authority of the bourgeoisie and "thus to seize upon the new socialized means of production." They can do this only "by giving up the old method of distribution hitherto existing as far as they are concerned, and with it the old method of distribution generally." Marx advocated the substitution of Communism for private property and private production.

The Communists—the political party for whom the *Communist Manifesto* was to serve as the expression of their articles of belief—form but a part of the struggling

proletariat, the part which is conscious of the trend of the development of things. They "differ from the other proletarian parties in two ways. In the proletarian struggles in each nation the Communists lay stress on those interests which are not concerned with nationality, but which are common to the general body of the proletariat all over the world, and those interests they seek to get recognized. Then again, in the different stages through which the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is bound to pass, they always strive to safeguard the interests of the movement as a whole."

"The body of communist doctrine is not based on imaginary ideas, or on principles discovered or invented by some visionary anxious to improve the world. It is but the general expression of actual conditions in the existing struggle of class against class, the expression of the march of history taking place before our very eyes."

These ideas, as I have already observed, were later on either worded more clearly or developed and extended, or in some cases modified. But the root principles of the Marxian theory of the Social Movement were already there. The question only is, what is their historical importance? and how is their splendid success and their continuance for over half-a-century to be accounted for?

Before we proceed to answer these questions we must note one thing. The works of Marx and Engels after 1842, or, indeed, after they had been corrected—that is to say from 1847 to 1883 in the case of Marx, and from 1847 to 1895 in the case of Engels—appear at the first glance as a miscellaneous collection of ideas. It is only after a close study of them and of the spirit with which both men were filled, that their meaning and their systematic arrangement became apparent. It may then also be observed that although there are certain fundamental ideas in all the writings of both Marx and Engels, yet at different periods in their lives they follow different lines of thought which often mar the unity of their system. The majority of the writers on the Marxian doctrines,

especially the non-Socialist ones, have made the mistake of not keeping the different elements apart, and have thus failed to appreciate the historical importance of these theories.

In the first place we must point out—what is trite enough now-a-days—that it was a scientific achievement of the first order to look at the Social Movement in its historic aspect and to put into true relation with each other economic, social and political circumstances. It was Marx who applied the idea of development to the Social Movement. There were great thinkers before Marx who had attempted to place Socialism and the Social Movement in their historical perspective, but none of them succeeded in expressing the historical influences in as clear, as illuminating and as effective a form as he did. Marx also held that political revolutions are in reality the transference of power from one social class to another, but he expressed it much more convincingly than any other writer. In order to explain the growth of social classes and their struggle one against another, he takes the economic changes as his starting-point. In the *Misère*,¹ even before the *Communist Manifesto* was published, he had declared “there never was a political movement which was not a social movement at the same time.” In this—and for us it is the main point at present—the proletariat was brought to a full consciousness of itself, and to the knowledge that it was an inevitable result of historical development.

For Marx, and for the proletariat, the fundamental principles of the programme of the Social Movement, no less than its tactics, followed with certainty from this historical conception. “They are but the general expression of the actual conditions of an existing class war,” was the somewhat loose wording in the *Communist Manifesto*. Expressed with a little more precision, the theory of Marx

¹ The full title of this work is *Misère de la Philosophie, réponse à la philosophie de la misère de M. Proudhomme*, and it was published in Paris and Brussels in 1847, a year before the *Communist Manifesto*.

connected the unconscious, instinctive ideal of the proletariat, which was beginning to take shape, and the actual conditions which had come about as a result of economic progress. But the tactics of the movement were regulated in accordance with the idea that revolutions cannot be made, but are bound up with certain previously existing economic conditions. The class struggle in both its forms, whether political (which is what is chiefly dealt with in the *Communist Manifesto*) or economic (in favour of which Marx had already written in the *Misère*)—the class struggle was looked upon but as a means to be used by the proletariat to safeguard its interests in the process of economic changes. In saying this, Marx only expressed an idea which would necessarily be adopted as the creed of every proletarian movement as soon as ever it was understood. Socialism as the end, and class war as the means! This was no longer the opinion of an individual here or there; it was generally upheld and regarded as an historical necessity.

We said *necessarily* be adopted. Why must every proletarian movement *necessarily* aim at democratic collectivism—i. e. the socialization of the instruments of production on a democratic basis? The answer is clear.

The Social Movement in modern times seeks to bring about what is usually described as the emancipation of the proletariat. This emancipation has two aspects, an ideal and a material one. A class may regard itself as emancipated in the ideal sense only when it is at least economically independent, when those who belong to it have become the subjects (as distinguished from the objects) in economic activity. In the case of the proletariat which is economically dependent on Capital, it could emancipate itself only by abolishing its dependence. The proletariat might conceivably appoint agents to carry on the work of production according to its instructions. In that case the capitalist undertakers would no longer direct production; that, in reality, would then be done by the proletariat, which would accordingly be master of the situation. As long as this

mastery in one form or another does not exist, no one can say that the proletariat as a class has emancipated itself.

In the same way there is no emancipation in the material sense so long as those conditions continue which are the real causes for the social inferiority of the class as a class, conditions which result from the capitalist system. It follows, therefore, that if the proletariat as a class is working for some end, it can only be to remove this system. This may be done in one of two ways. Either production on a small scale (to which production on a large scale succeeded) must be re-introduced, with its system of journeymen workers each engaged in manual labour in his own little shop (what is virtually the Craft system). In that case the abolition of the capitalist organization would be a retrograde step and would be in the interests of the lower middle class. Or, as the other alternative, it would be possible to retain production on a large scale and yet to abolish the capitalist organization by socializing the means of production. There is no third course possible. Accordingly, if the proletariat does not adopt the retrograde step suggested by the first alternative, only one way of removing Capitalism remains, and that is to organize society on a socialist basis. As a matter of fact the proletariat cannot possibly take the retrograde step, for by its very nature it is bound up closely with production on a large scale. It is in a sense but the shadow of production on a large scale. The proletariat only comes into existence where such production prevails and can live only so long as that lives. And so we may say that the aims of the Social Movement must necessarily be socialistic, and that they follow logically from the economic position of the proletariat.

All this is to prove the necessity of the ideal. But the necessity of its realization is another matter.

Why is it that the class war is the only way to achieve the end in view?

Modern society may be regarded as an artificial mixture of many social classes; it is made up of groups of

individuals whose homogeneity arises from the fact that they have a common interest in one and the same economic system. Thus we may distinguish between the nobility and gentry on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie on the other: the one representing a feudal system of land tenure, the other representing Capitalism; or between the lower middle class and the proletariat: the former the representative of what has been called the Guild system, and the latter being those who live by weekly wages. Each of these groups of individuals with common economic interests has its advocates among the "intellectual" classes of the community, among those who are not engaged in productive labour¹—artists, government officials or scholars, and the like—and they usually give their support to one class or another according to their origin or their social position.

Membership of a social class has a twofold influence. On the one hand, the thoughts and feelings of the individuals who form the class have a tendency to similarity, since outer circumstances influence them in much the same way. Gradually, therefore, a specific view of life becomes current among them. They value the same things; they cherish the same ideals. On the other hand, membership of a social class produces a common resolution to maintain the standpoint of the class and its economic position, and produces what may be called class interests.

We see then that first there is a natural difference between class and class; later, a special class interest arises. It is clear that wherever other interests stand in the way of the interests of any class, this must of necessity lead to class opposition. Of course, it is conceivable that the standpoint of one class need not positively clash with the interests of another. But it is conceivable only for a short period; in the long run it is impossible. The interests of the nobility and gentry must clash at one point with those of the bourgeoisie; the interests of the capitalist with those of the proletariat; the interests of the small inde-

¹ Cf. Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, Bk. I, ch. III, § 4.

pendent handicraftsman or shopkeeper with those of the wealthy middle class. Each class strives to make its own interests general and thereby shuts out the interests of others. We may say—

“If one presses in, he thereby ousts his neighbour;
He who would remain must thrust the others forth . . .
There is a struggle here and the strong alone is victor.”

There may, it is true, be differences of opinion with regard to the last point. Must there really be struggle? Is there no hope that the social classes will give up such of their claims as stand in the way of other classes, whether it be out of their love for humanity, or for pity's sake, or because they place the common cause above the cause of their own class? It is difficult to say. There is no more scientific proof for the one view than for the other, for in the last resort it depends on the personal feelings of each individual. There is, however, this to be said in support of the view of Marx, that history knows of no case where a class has freely given up the rights which it regarded as belonging to itself. If such reputed cases ever are mentioned, their inaccuracy may be shown by letting actual, dispassionate facts speak for themselves. On the other hand, there are innumerable examples in history where some reform or other was commenced by benevolent philanthropists—perhaps by some high-minded public servant—only to be soon shattered against the iron wall which guarded the threatened interests of the class in power. People sometimes point to the night of the 4th of August, 1789, but they forget the hundreds of burning castles in France. They recall the Agrarian Reforms in Prussia, but they forget not only the French Revolution but also the Declaration of 1816. They talk of the wonderful improvements which the social spirit brought about in the eighteen-forties in the position of the wage-earning classes in England, but they forget the Chartist Movement and all that it meant. There is no need to adduce further examples. The only conclusive evidence against the view of Marx would be to furnish even one

case in history where a social class, against its own interests and because of altruistic motives, made concessions of any value. There are certainly cases on record where influential individuals did this; but of classes as a whole there is not one. If that is so, then indeed there is no other conclusion than the words of the poet, "the strong alone is victor."

We now have the last link in our chain of thought. First, class differences; then, class interests; then, class opposition, and, finally, class war.

When we consider that the main points of the Marxian doctrines only describe things as they are, that they are so self-evident and that they draw attention to what lies before our very eyes, we shall easily understand why it is that they became the bedrock on which Socialism now stands foursquare. This will be all the more easy to perceive when we remember that the theory of Marx was so wide as to include all tendencies of thought. Marx was able to give a theoretical basis to the Social Movement because he did not lay down a programme for any particular party, because he did not attempt to give an exact picture of future conditions, because he left it to each individual to imagine the class war for himself. His leading ideas were, as it were, a mantle in which all manner of single programmes might be wrapped. It is true that he did not contribute all the groundwork of proletarian thought, but what he did contribute was of the utmost importance. He inspired the proletariat with self-consciousness, with a trust in their own strength, and with a belief in their future. He included all ideals, therefore, in the one great ideal of membership of a class. "The proletariat have nothing to lose except their chains, but a world is theirs to win. Proletarians of all lands, unite!" But let it be noted, only proletarians. It was thus that the Social Movement was strengthened and its goal set before it in as clear a fashion as possible. Not the least cause for the pre-eminence of Marxian teaching over all others was the fact that Marx limited Socialism to the

movement of one particular social class, the proletariat. That put an end to the vagueness which had been characteristic of the majority of the socialist systems. It was no longer "the people," or "the poor," or some other such indefinite agent that was to carry forward the Social Movement. It was now a clearly defined group in the social system with common interests; it was the Proletariat as a distinct social class.

But let us understand that all this applies only to the fundamental ideas of Karl Marx, and it is only these that we have set forth for the present. It does not apply to all his theories. Many of them, as we shall see, were found impracticable and were discarded. These we shall discuss later on. What we are concerned with here is to point out the inalienable legacy, "the possession for ever,"¹ as I have always termed it, which Marx gave to the struggling proletariat, and to show his immense importance for the modern Social Movement.

It will by now have become clear that I was perfectly just to Karl Marx to bring him into relation with the great historical and realistic tendencies which since the commencement of the nineteenth century have been undermining the structure built up by the rationalist theories of society and of its history. The view of life from which the teaching of Marx emanated was as much opposed to that on which this structure was built as the view of life held by those who founded the new philosophy. The belief in the naturally good man was displaced by the conviction that man is generally actuated by selfish rather than by noble motives, and that despite all culture and all progress he still has the "bête humaine" within him. This has for its logical conclusion that if we wish to achieve aught in the world we must appeal above all to the interests of mankind. Marx therefore was perfectly right when he realized that if a class such as the proletariat was to be emancipated, it would not suffice to appeal to the love of humanity as a lever against the interests of

¹ Κτήμα ἐς ἀεί. (Thucyd. I 22.)

the capitalist class. In the last instance it is nothing but this consideration that leads to the theory, and to the practical expression, of the class war. War was the solution looked to by the rough and unlovely proletariat, which began to increase in numbers after the middle of the nineteenth century; war and not peace; war and not conciliation. It was of no material consequence that the struggle did not break out into street fights; that made no difference in its essence; it was still war. And this was the struggle in which the new generation should gather experience in order that it might help forward, and live under, the higher organization of society which was about to spring forth from the capitalist system.

The Marxian line of argument also gave due recognition to another aspect of the new conception of society and of history—the conception that regarded the organization of society as it is (or as it should be) not as being the well-planned scheme of any one individual, no matter how much in accordance with reason, but rather as the result of a long chain of historic causes. That was precisely what Karl Marx taught. He held that Capitalism as it developed would itself produce the conditions which were necessary for the establishment of a socialist community. When that social organization comes about it will do so not because it is the ideally best, or because it is most reasonable, but solely and only because it is most suitable to the slowly developing conditions of life. Social ideals are worthless Utopias if they are merely the products of some dreamer's fancy. They become valuable and possible of realization only when they fit in with existing economic conditions, and are at the same time brought about by them. The realization of the good and the beautiful is limited by economic necessity. "Ideas separated from the interests which are to make them possible are but a poor show," Marx wrote in his *Holy Family* in 1845. He held that the conditions created by the mutual relation between the capitalist and proletarian classes, the economic conditions, that is, which were a result of his-

torical development, were of such a nature as to point to a possible realization of the ideal for which the proletariat were striving.

Put briefly, the historic significance of the Marxian doctrines for the Social Movement may be expressed in this way. Marx laid down the two foundations on which the movement was to rest, when he enunciated that its end in view was the socialization of the instruments of production, and the means to achieve that end class war. These doctrines had sufficient potentiality to give the movement a common aim, and yet not potentiality enough to check the development of national and other characteristics. By making the Social Movement the resultant of historic development, Marx showed what the real factors were which brought it about, showed how the movement was based on the economic conditions of a particular time at a particular place, and on the personal characteristics of the men and women living in those conditions. In other words, he proved that on economic and psychological grounds it was inevitable, and he thus became the founder of historical (as opposed to rationalistic) or realistic (as opposed to Utopian) Socialism.

CHAPTER IV

THE TEACHING OF MARX CRITICIZED

PREFATORY

IN speaking of the teaching of Marx, we mean not only those fundamental ideas which were mentioned in the previous chapter, but also the materialistic conception of history which is usually associated with the name of Marx, and the view of capitalist development which both he and Engels put forward.

The whole of this system has been subjected to a thoroughly critical examination during the last decade or so, and for the most part the criticism has been of a destructive character. We propose to glance at it before proceeding.

One thing is noteworthy: this criticism is quite impersonal, and is not associated with any man's name in particular. Indeed, there is perhaps a good deal of truth in the view of one English writer who said recently, "Of this work (of Marx), for the most of those who accepted it, the first hostile critic that made any impression was time." Here and there a stone was removed from the edifice of the Marxian system; a whole army of moles hailing from the socialist as well as from the bourgeois camp, endangered the foundations on which it stood, until at last the whole structure collapsed as silently as the Campanile in Venice. We shall see the various stages in this critical undermining process, but we shall have to content ourselves here with broad outlines. Moreover, we shall not attempt to include the whole of the doctrines of Marx in our survey; our concern will be only with those of them that deal with Socialism, that is, with those that put forth

socialist teaching, or throw any light on the Social Movement.

I. CONTRADICTIONS OF THE MARXIAN THEORY

When the first edition of this book appeared, some eleven years ago, and I had characterized Marx and Engels as the founders of realistic (or historical) Socialism, just as I have done in the last chapter, I added the following observations—

“There is no doubt that in the popular view, Marx and Engels (who must be named together in this connection) appear in an entirely different light to the one here presented. People were influenced in their opinion of both men by the unimportant facts of their teaching rather than by those that really mattered.

“The prevailing view regards them not only as something other than social and political realists, but as being at the opposite extreme: as the originators and guardians of the idea of revolution pure and simple. This conception is excusable; a cursory acquaintance with their writings would in most cases lead to this conclusion. One reads of clanging chains that must be broken, of revolutions which are approaching, of bloody struggles and of murders. What are we to say to these things?

“Marx on one occasion is said to have confessed, ‘I myself am not really a Marxist!’ But he meant this not in the same sense as I do when I assert that Marx and Engels were not always consistently Marxian either in their theories or in their lives.

“There is certainly in their theories much that is hardly in accord with the fundamental ideas on which the Marxian system is built up, and these disharmonious elements may be traced to one source—the revolutionary passion which could not contain itself, and which dimmed the outlook of both men, who ordinarily saw so clearly.

“I am thinking, for example, of their groundless belief

in what may be called the Fall of Man through the introduction of private property, which signalized the beginning of 'history,' and first brought into prominence its motive forces (though they do not make clear why private property was introduced). I am thinking of their assumption that the condition of mankind after the introduction of Socialism will be one in which there will be no place for struggle, and much more to the same effect. Here and everywhere the old dreams of a paradise lost and regained, and of a prehistoric golden age of universal happiness reappear, but they are out of harmony with the newer ideas, and so strike a somewhat jarring note.

"It was the same in the lives of both men. The old revolutionary Adam is never wholly suppressed; he constantly reappears and makes his presence felt. From 1845 onwards, both Marx and Engels never ceased dreaming of revolutions of a very real kind. Nor were they tired of announcing their speedy advent. Such conduct showed that they were not looking at things as they are, and that their judgment of political, economic and social conditions was somewhat warped; it proved that they misjudged the pace of progress, and, above all, it was contrary to one of their own vital principles which said that revolutions cannot be 'made.'

"Yet all this may be easily explained psychologically. It is quite true that both Marx and Engels all through their lives never ceased preaching that realism which we have described as the heart of their doctrine; with their splendid intellects and cool judgment they saw things so clearly. But we must not forget that they conceived their doctrines amid the thunder of the revolutionary conflict, that they themselves were types of those fiery, restless souls who ran to and fro in order to set Europe ablaze. Both men were exiles, and as we think of the mockery and the scorn, the hatred, the contempt and the persecution which they had to endure at the hands of their powerful opponents, we shall the more readily understand that their hearts were filled with fury. We shall have to admit that in

these circumstances it required no little self-control not to take every opportunity that offered to strike down their hated opponents. It was when the gathering force of the hate within them obtained the upper hand that their cool, realistic selves became powerless, and the old revolutionary spirit overflowed their entire personalities. And yet, despite all this, at all critical times they showed clearly enough that the bed rock of their system was a social and political realism. It showed itself in their determined opposition to the revolutionary party and the tendency to riot. We see it in their struggle with the Willich-Schapper party in 1850, in their opposition to Bakunin in the International, to which reference will be made later, in their expressions of disagreement with the Anarchists, in their campaign against Dühring, in their refusal to throw in their lot with the Young Socialists. This all proves that they stood for the evolutionary principle in the Social Movement, and desired that it should prevail."

Such, then, was my first view of Marx and Engels: that there were two conceptions of social development within their breasts, each struggling for mastery. Many people regarded this as extreme heterodoxy, and roundly upbraided me for it.

Reviewing what I then wrote, I myself now feel doubtful whether it is justifiable to regard Marx and Engels as holding the realist view of social phenomena all through their lives, and to believe that the opposite views to which they often gave expression were but momentary aberrations. Perhaps it is truer to assume that both Marx and Engels (or possibly Engels alone), as a result of their practical political experience, became convinced of the truth of the principles which they had put forward in their youth. At any rate, that would appear to follow from the confession which Engels made towards the end of his life in the introduction to his *Struggle of the Social Classes in France*, which may be looked upon as a kind of political will and testament. He says there—

"History proved that we were wrong—we and those who like us, in 1848, awaited the speedy success of the proletariat. It became perfectly clear that economic conditions all over the Continent were by no means as yet sufficiently matured for superseding the capitalist organization of production. This was proved by the economic revolution which commenced on the continent of Europe after 1848 and developed industries in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland and, recently, also in Russia, and made Germany into an industrial state of the first rank—all on a capitalist basis, which shows that in 1848 the prevailing conditions were still capable of expansion. And to-day we have a huge international army of Socialists, marching onward and daily growing in numbers, well organized and disciplined, with political sagacity and a feeling of certain success in their breasts. If this mighty proletarian army has not yet reached its goal, if it is destined to gain its ends only in a long, drawn-out struggle, making headway but slowly, step by step, this only proves how impossible it was in 1848 to change social conditions by forcible means. . . . The time for small minorities to place themselves at the head of the ignorant masses and resort to force in order to bring about revolutions, is gone. A complete change in the organization of society can be brought about only by the conscious co-operation of the masses; they must be alive to the aim in view; they must know what they want. The history of the last fifty years has taught that. But if the masses are to understand the line of action that is necessary, we must work hard and continuously to bring it home to them. That, indeed, is what we are now engaged upon, and our success is driving our opponents to despair. The irony of destiny is turning everything topsy-turvy. We, the 'revolutionaries,' are profiting more by lawful than by unlawful and revolutionary means. The parties of order, as they call themselves, are being slowly destroyed by their own weapons. Their cry is that of Odilon Barrot: 'Lawful means are killing us.' . . . We, on the contrary, are thriving on them, our muscles are

strong, and our cheeks are red, and we look as though we intend to live for ever!"

But, when all is said, it is not the personalities of Marx and Engels that matter so much, but rather the question whether there are any views scattered about in their writings which are totally opposed to their fundamental conception of social development. Contradictions of this kind there certainly are. In the quotation from an early edition of this book I have already hinted at one or two. Here I want to add another, perhaps the most important of all; it has been called the theory of the "Dictatorship of the proletariat," and apparently it is still believed in by the faithful. It sets forth that the change from the capitalist to the socialist system of society will be brought about by an act of violence. The proletariat will seize political power and carry through a scheme of legislation which shall establish the new order. We see here the reappearance of the old rational, Utopian belief that the new order is ready made and complete (*i. e.* in the minds of Socialists), and all that is necessary is to take steps to get it established. Only when we imagine a view like this to have been in the mind of Marx can we understand his position at the time of the rising of the Commune in 1871—that maddest of all risings, which had not the least chance of success. Yet he took it seriously, and believed that the Paris Commune would "serve as a lever" to overturn the economic foundations on which the class system and the superiority of one class over another were established. And this in a country where the first signs of the socialization of the means of production were hardly as yet discernible, so that the preliminary conditions for the new order were not yet in existence.

I have already mentioned that the idea of the Dictatorship of the proletariat may be traced to Robespierre. We can understand that he should have given expression to it. For what Robespierre wanted was a revolution brought about by constitutional means; that is to say, by the use of the legislative machinery. But it is contrary to

all the lessons of history and of life to imagine that it is possible to bring about a new social order by force. A new social order must gradually develop from the old. The misconception arises from a wrong meaning given to the word revolution. A real revolution generally has a political character, and, of course, can be "made." But the social revolution which is to replace the capitalist organization of society by one on socialist lines is something wholly different. Just as no single capitalist undertaking was ever brought about by a forcible legal change, and just as all "revolutions" in history have had but little influence on social development (the only economic change brought about by the French Revolution, the greatest of them all, was the division of the land, and that was a step inimical to capitalist development), so in the same way the new "revolution" for establishing a socialist society must come about in the course of natural development. Otherwise we should have to conceive a state of things hardly likely. We should have to imagine that all the conditions necessary for bringing about the new order of society were already present, but that its realization was prevented by a clique of politicians in possession of power. To remove these politicians, therefore, was all that was required. In such a case it would be a question only of removing obstacles out of the way, but by no means a case of the Dictatorship of the proletariat, having a constructive programme.

The whole absurdity of this theory becomes apparent when it is applied to democratic countries like Switzerland and the United States of America. What work would there be for a Dictatorship of the proletariat to do in these countries? (In reality the Dictatorship of the proletariat in this supposition would be anti-democratic in its nature !)

Turn it as we will, the theory of the Dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be made to fit into a historical, realistic view of society. It is a foreign element, coming from a system entirely different. That Marx held the

theory for so long—I do not know how long—is only another proof in support of my thesis that in the doctrines of Marx there are contradictory elements, and all the sophistry in the world will not be able to bring them into agreement.

II. THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT

From our presentation of the fundamental ideas which underlie Marx's theory of society, it will have become evident that Marx held a particular view concerning the period of history in which we are now living, that is to say, concerning the age of Capitalism, and that this view tried to show the justification for the socialist movement. He showed it in two ways. In the first place, he attempted to prove that the present capitalist system, by virtue of its inherent qualities, contained within itself the germs of its own decay; and in the second place, that as the capitalist system decays it creates the necessary conditions for the birth of socialist society. Stripped of the terms peculiar to the Hegelian philosophy in which Karl Marx clothed these ideas, they may be thus expressed. (The reader must excuse one or two repetitions.) The capitalist system, in its onward flow, develops phenomena which prevent the smooth working of the great producing machine. On the one hand we have increasing socialization of production—the tendency for production to be more and more on a large scale; for big businesses to swallow up smaller ones—and the increasing intensity in production. On the other hand, the direction of production and its distribution (where the share of the capitalist class becomes larger and larger) are still in private hands—in those of the capitalist undertaker.

These tendencies come into more serious opposition as time goes on, and the result is that commercial crises, that disease to which capitalist organization of industry is so liable, appear periodically, and with more and more

disastrous results. Already in the *Communist Manifesto*, and also in his *Anti-Dühring*, Marx expressed himself clearly on this point. "The history of industry and of commerce has been for the last decade the history of the rebellion of the forces that go to bring about production against the modern conditions in the distribution of property, by which the bourgeois and their power are supported. One need but mention the commercial crises, which in their periodic appearance threaten more and more the existence of society as at present constituted. Not only are many of the commodities already produced wholly destroyed in these crises, but a good many of the instruments of production are subject to a similar fate. In these crises a social epidemic breaks out such as in all earlier ages would have been accounted madness—the epidemic of over-production. Society finds itself for the time being in a state of barbarism; it is as though a famine or a general war of extermination had cut off all supplies of the necessities of life. Industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. And why? Because society has too much of civilization, too much of the necessities of life, too much industry and too much commerce."

The inner conflict in the capitalist organization of society is reflected in the growing opposition between the two classes on which that organization rests—between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The bourgeois class, owing to the "centralization of capital," is represented by a constantly decreasing number of capitalists, and the proletariat by a constantly increasing mass of impoverished individuals who sink deeper and deeper in misery. "With the constant decrease in the number of capitalist magnates, there is an increase in the mass of the wretched, the oppressed, the enslaved, the degenerate and the exploited" (*Capital*). "The modern worker, instead of rising with the advance of industry, sinks deeper and deeper because of the conditions which his own class imposes upon him. The worker becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops even more quickly than

population or wealth. This makes it abundantly clear that the bourgeoisie is incapable of remaining the ruling class in society, and of forcing society to accept the conditions of its existence as a general law regulating the existence of society as a whole. The bourgeoisie is incapable of bearing rule because it is unable to ensure for its slaves a bare existence, because it is forced to place them in a position where, instead of maintaining society, society must maintain them" (*Communist Manifesto*). It is the misery here mentioned that produces rebellion; the proletariat rises against the ruling class. And it is able to do this because it has been "trained, united and organized" by "the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production." "The hour of capitalist property has struck. Those who have expropriated others are now themselves expropriated" (*Capital*). "Society will openly and directly take possession of the means of production" (*Anti-Dühring*), and the difficulties inherent in the capitalistic system will be removed. To take hold of power in this way, and so to introduce a new economic organization (the socialistic), will be possible because all the necessary conditions will have been created by the capitalist organization—"constantly increasing co-operation in labour, application of technical knowledge, the derivation of the maximum produce from the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into such as may be used in common by many workers, the inclusion of all peoples in the net of the world market" (*Capital*). Even to-day "the change to huge agencies for production and exchange, the great joint-stock companies and the growth of State ownership in many directions—all these go to prove that there is no necessity for the bourgeoisie in the direction and organization of modern production" (*Anti-Dühring*).

This broad theory of evolution comprises a number of single theories.¹ We shall examine these to see whether they are true; that is to say, whether they square with actual facts. In what order we look at them is of little

consequence. But I shall start with the two which have maintained themselves down to this day as the most probable ones—the theory of concentration and the theory of socialization, as they have been called—and both of them are closely related.

(1) *The Theory of Concentration* was adopted by Marx from Louis Blanc, in whose writings it may be found complete. Marx enlarged and illustrated it in a most brilliant fashion. The theory lays it down that under the pressure of the competition inherent in the capitalist system, capitalist undertaking completely drives out the methods of production which existed in pre-capitalist times; it swallows up the small, independent producers; and then “one capitalist destroys many,” or “many capitalists are expropriated by a few,” i. e. undertakings on a large scale prevail more and more, and economic development tends to bring about a state of things where everything is controlled from one centre.

This theory is broadly true. Indeed, the prophecies (if prophecies they can be called) of Louis Blanc and of Marx have come to pass so exactly, that the insight of these two men is worthy of the highest admiration. During the last twenty years, as we know, there has been a concentration of capital by the formation of Trusts such as Marx in his boldest flights of imagination could never have dreamed of. Especially is this the case in the United States of America, where we get the best examples of these giant undertakings. According to the latest statistics, no less than 8,664 concerns which were formerly independent are now amalgamated in a few trusts with a capital of 20,000 million dollars. Of these, seven of the “greater” industrial trusts contain 1,528 concerns formerly independent, and possess a capital of 2,663 million dollars. The six largest railway trusts are even better placed; they have a capital of 9,017 million dollars!

Nevertheless, the theory of concentration as expressed by Marx must be modified in certain directions in order to bring it into accord with the position of modern knowledge.

In the first place, Marx over-estimated the speed in which capital tended to concentrate. The pre-capitalist forms are not swept away as rapidly as Marx thought, nor do the giant organizations make such general progress as he foreshadowed, even in those branches of industry where the tendencies in that direction are great. To-day in Germany, according to the last census, there are (leaving out all agricultural pursuits) 4,770,669 persons employed in "small establishments," i. e. establishments employing one to five persons. When we remember that the whole industrial army numbers some ten million people, it is apparent that the employees in "small" establishments number nearly half. This refers to industry alone; in commercial pursuits, the proportion is about two-thirds. Indeed, between 1882 and 1895 there was an increase of 10 per cent. in the population connected with "small" industrial concerns, and in commerce the increase in the corresponding class was nearly 50 per cent. for the same period. The conditions in other lands are the same.

Some scholars have rightly asserted (I myself in my *Modern Capitalism* have sought to bring a complete proof for the statement) that these "small businesses" are really dependent on Capitalism. Even so, their existence stands in the way of complete acceptance of Marx's theory of concentration. The same holds good with regard to the development of capitalist undertakings. The concentration here is a much slower process than Marx assumed. It is true that the large concerns increase much more quickly than those of middle size, partly at the expense of the latter. But the middle-sized ones still continue. In 1895 there were almost as many people employed in these (again leaving agriculture out of account) as in the large ones—two and a half against three millions. From 1882 to 1895 there was an increase in them of over 76 per cent., which was almost as large as the increase in the "large" concerns—over 88 per cent.

In the second place, the theory of concentration cannot

be applied to production in agriculture. Statistics seem to show that there is no tendency either to the abolition of tenant farmers or to expansion in the size of large farms. On the contrary, there is, if anything, a tendency the other way—the size of single farms appears to decrease. In Germany, for example, the number of small farms (5 to 20 hectare) increased from 28 per cent. to 29 per cent. of the area of the country in the period from 1882 to 1895, while the number of large farms (20 to 100 hectare) decreased slightly from 30.9 per cent. to 30.4 per cent.; those over 100 hectare from 25.6 per cent. to 25.5 per cent. On the whole, it may be said that in agriculture there are no changes in the distribution of property and in the organization of production. Even in the United States, the land of Capitalism *par excellence*, where there is no tradition to stem capitalist development, and where agriculture is carried on in a rational spirit, the picture is not very different. Here, too, the tendency is for farms to decrease in size. The average area of a farm in 1850 was 61.5 acres; in 1860, 51.9 acres; in 1870, 53.7 acres; in 1880, 53.1 acres; in 1890, 57.4 acres, and in 1900, 49.4 acres. There is no sign of concentration here.

In this connection, too, it has been asserted—and with some truth—that farmers are only independent so far as appearance goes; in reality they are but the vassals of Capitalism, which fleeces them in different ways. That may be so. But it is not concentration. Evidently, then, there is none of it in agriculture.

(2) *The Theory of Socialization* is closely connected with that of concentration. It asserts that capitalist development will eventually produce all the conditions necessary for bringing about a socialist, or (as Marx and Engels frequently say) communist, order of economic life. In other words, the theory holds that the elements of the coming economic system are maturing within the framework of Capitalism. This theory, which is clearly of extreme importance for the foundation of the realistic standpoint, is of all the teachings of Marx and Engels

most characteristically theirs. It is without doubt one of the happiest and most fruitful contributions to social science during the last generation. Unfortunately, however, it is just this theory in the system of Marx and Engels which has been most insufficiently developed. The theory is expressed as a side issue, and even then is not always clear; it is often unbalanced, and sometimes wrongly stated. But, separating its component parts, it may be described as follows:

By utilizing improved processes in production in the capitalist organization of industry, it is possible to increase the productivity of the labour of society, and thus develop the productive powers of society. In this way, "by a wise distribution of work, there is a possibility—for the first time in the history of mankind—not only of producing sufficient for the necessary subsistence of all the members of society and for setting aside a reserve, but also of giving each one sufficient leisure, so that what is of value in culture, science, art, social intercourse and so forth, may continue, and be turned from being a monopoly of the ruling class into the common possession of the whole of society. This is the important point. For as soon as the productive power of human labour has developed thus far, there is no longer any reason for the existence of a ruling class. As a last resort, it was always said in defence of the difference between the higher and the lower classes, that there must be one class which should not be burdened with the necessity for producing daily sustenance, so that it might have time to devote itself to the higher needs of society. There was some justification for this view in days gone by, but the industrial revolution of the last hundred years has made it quite untenable."

All this is partly right, although to some extent it is exaggerated, and also partly wrong.

The power of production on the part of society as a whole has greatly increased, but it has not increased a "thousandfold"—as Engels says in the passage quoted.

During the last hundred years, thanks to a series of extraordinary events, it has increased only fivefold. I have calculated that the power of production of the German people has grown, in the period from 1840 to 1895, in the ratio of one to three. It is, of course, impossible to give actual figures for this statement. But it is perfectly clear that to speak of the increase as having been a thousandfold is absurd. The mistake usually made by most people is that they generalize from some particular point (e. g. the enormous advance in the process of spinning). What is usually overlooked in these cases is that, after all, we are still largely dependent on the produce of the earth for most of our needs. But it is very questionable whether the power of production in agriculture has increased; at any rate the increase can only be very small. True, we have succeeded by more extensive cultivation in making the products of the soil three or four times as great as they were, but we are by no means certain whether the outlay of labour and capital has been proportional to, or less than, the result achieved. Nay, it is even possible that it has been more. Nor ought we to conclude (as Kautsky does) that there has been an increase in agricultural production because there is a decrease in the numbers of agricultural population. In the growing intensity in the demand for labour we cannot tell how much of it is transferred from agriculture to industry, where machines used in agriculture, drain pipes, artificial manures, etc., are now made. The increase in the wealth of European nations during the last generation was due to the opening up of new virgin soils. As soon as these are used up, wealth will increase much more slowly, and all the improvements in the field of industry and of transport due to technical knowledge, will be able to do nothing to hasten its growth. That is to say, only so long as we are dependent on products of the soil for our elementary needs of clothing, food and housing.

We must remember, moreover, that an increase in the power of production adds but little to the wealth of the

individual so long as population grows with the frightful speed it has been doing. In 1800 there were 153 million people living in France, Italy, Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, Germany, Russia and the United States; in 1900 the number was 398 million!

Nevertheless, we may admit that the great mass of people would be enabled to live in greater comfort than they do to-day if the distribution of wealth was more even, and the process of production organized on still more economic lines. It might then be that a seven or eight hours' working-day would suffice to produce the necessities of life. But even if all this be admitted, how does it affect Engels' position?

It is certainly true that as wealth increases the number of those people increases who have leisure to devote to things outside their calling, and also the number of artists and authors. (By the way, I doubt whether art or science owes much to this increase. The experience of the last hundred years rather goes to prove the contrary.) But this does not affect the question as to whether any particular economic or social system has strength enough to continue. No social class becomes the ruling class because it writes poetry, or paints, or cultivates good manners. Nor does it become indispensable when the demand for art and science can be satisfied in other ways. This is an interesting thought to which Engels here gives expression, but once more it belongs to the rationalistic world of ideas.

Or did Engels possibly imagine that there would come a time when, because of the improvements in the instruments of production, the whole of the economic activity of society would become so insignificant that society would have no need to devote much attention to it; that, indeed, a casual attention to production would suffice; that there would be no occasion to devote oneself entirely to the *artes sordidae*? Some such ideas are in fact met with in the writings of Marx and Engels, and they have been developed by their earliest followers. One of the favourite

ideas of Marx was that a perfected machinery will gradually remove the necessity for specialization, and that thus every man will be enabled to do work of any kind without training and experience. He says: "Since the whole activity in a factory depends on machines and not on labourers, the work of production may go on unimpaired, even when the human actors that participate in it are constantly changed." Or again: "The characteristic of the division of labour in a factory is that it is no longer specialized. But as soon as there is no development in specialization, a tendency arises for each individual to develop himself all round rather than to specialize in any one particular. And thus the factory with its machinery has no need of specialists." This statement must be contradicted in its entirety. It is by no means true that as machinery develops, specialization is gradually made unnecessary. For we must not forget that a very high degree of specialization is required in the management of some machines, certainly as much as for some kinds of manual labour; and in many cases there is as great a necessity on the part of the worker to adapt himself either bodily or intellectually to the mechanism before him. It is only the most skilled compositors that can work the composing machine; only the very highly qualified men who can attend to the machine which attaches soles to the boot; a skilled engineer is required to take charge of a powerful steam engine; an engine-driver is a specialist in his way; and a self-binding machine must have a highly skilled attendant. All this shows (as I have proved at length in my *Modern Capitalism*) that there is by no means a universal tendency for the process of production to become automatic, that is to say, to be carried on by means of machines only. Manual labour will continue to exist side by side with the factory, more especially in a socialist community, because it will have special functions of its own to fulfil.

We see then that it is useless to seek in this direction for communist conditions inherent in the capitalist

economic system. Nor shall we find such conditions in the "transformation of the instruments of labour into such as may be used in common by many workers" or in "the swallowing up of all peoples in the net of the world market." The latter tendency (in the second quotation) is rather an obstacle, if anything, to the supplanting of the capitalist by the socialist organization of society, and the former (in the first quotation) is certainly an object lesson showing that it is possible to do without private property, and therefore is a training for the communist organization; but it does not show how to bring about that organization. This, however, is the important point: to show that as the capitalist system develops it becomes easier to replace individual direction in economic activity by communist direction.

Engels' reference to the joint-stock companies is no more successful. If he imagines that these prove how unnecessary capitalist organization is, he is very much mistaken; indeed, surprisingly mistaken for a man with so much business experience. Here are his words: "All the social functions of the capitalist are performed by paid officials. The capitalist has no longer any social activity but that of receiving dividends and speculating on the Stock Exchange." As a matter of fact, the joint-stock companies do not get rid of the work of the capitalist undertaker; all that they do is to transfer that work to salaried agents, whose activities are entirely of a capitalist nature; their aim is to sell; they are constantly on the look out for favourable opportunities; they speculate; they calculate: everything is as it was before. In the same way, they are dependent on the state of the market, and on the unstability in demand and in price; so that the uncertainty of success still remains. It is curious to note that both Marx and Engels threw cold water on co-operative societies, whereas they ought to have perceived how many more communistic elements there were in them than in joint-stock companies. Yet they welcomed the appearance of the latter. But they were mistaken. The mere

form of joint-stock companies does not in the least hasten the approach of the socialist organization of society.

Yet despite all that has been said, it is still true to assert that the conditions necessary to bring about the organization of society on a communist basis are being developed within the frame-work of the capitalist economic system; that this system is itself producing the means whereby it will be abolished. The decisive factor is the proper adjustment of supply to demand. What is required is that production on a large scale may be possible without the uncertainty of market, and other, conditions. These must be avoided by bringing about an equilibrium between supply and demand. Once this is achieved and there is production on a large scale, we have all the necessary conditions for production on a socialist basis. These conditions are fulfilled in proportion as the tendency grows for local productions to be consumed locally—as in the case of the supply of gas, water and electricity for large towns; or the tendency for consumers to combine either to draw their supplies in common from one source, or to manufacture the commodities of their need in common, as in the case of co-operative stores, etc., or the tendency for independent concerns to combine into large organizations, as in the case of trusts. But all this is rather the extension of the theory of socialization to which Marx and Engels gave expression, and is therefore hardly appropriate here. What we wanted to show in this place was that the theory was quite correct. But its application was not satisfactory. It was as though Marx and Engels had discovered a new star by correct calculations, but the star they took to be the one they had discovered was another. The real star of their theory was discovered by the observation of others.

The remaining theories which go to make up their whole theory of evolution were less happily conceived.

(3) *The Theory of Accumulation*, as I prefer to call it, lays it down that the number of great capitalists is on the decrease. That is distinctly not the case. In fact,

just the opposite is true, as I shall show by a few figures taken from my *German Economic Life in the Nineteenth Century*. Draw the line where we may, whether at 10,000 Mk. (£500) or 20,000 Mk. (£1,000) or 50,000 Mk. (£2,500) or 100,000 Mk. (£5,000), the result will always be that the number of individuals with incomes of this size increases much more quickly than those with smaller incomes. And they grow in proportion to the growth of wealth, so that the average incomes of this class remain the same. Let us take a wealthy city like Hamburg and consider the period from 1895 to 1899. In 1895 there were 3,443 persons with incomes between 10,000 Mk. and 25,000 Mk. (£500 and £1,250); in 1899 there were 4,082. The sum total of incomes in the first instance amounted to 53.5 million Mk. (2.6 million £); in the second case it was 63.1 million Mk. (3.1 million £). The average income therefore in the first instance was 15,853 Mk. (£792); in the second instance, 15,750 Mk. (£787). Similarly, in 1895 there were 1054 persons in Hamburg with incomes between 25,000 Mk. and 50,000 Mk. (£1,250 and £2,500); in 1899 there were 1,322. The total income of the first amounted to 36.9 million Mk. (1.8 million £), and of the second, it was 46 million Mk. (2.3 million £). In the one case the average income amounted to 35,987 Mk. (£1,799), in the other, 35,384 Mk. (£1,769). Again, in 1895 there were 484 persons with incomes between 50,000 and 100,000 Mk. (£2,500 and £5,000); in 1899 there were 585. The total amount in the first case was 33.1 million Mk. (1.6 million £), in the second 40.4 million Mk. (£2,000,000). The average in the first instance was 68,390 Mk. (£3,419); in the second, 69,000 Mk. (£3,453). Finally, in each of the years named there were 250 and 311 persons respectively with incomes over 100,000 Mk. (£5,000); the respective average incomes were 210,000 Mk. (£10,500) and 219,646 Mk. (£10,982). The same holds good for Berlin. Accordingly the theory is not correct when it asserts that the number of great capitalists is

constantly declining. We find that the nearer we approach to the break-up of the capitalist economic system, the more expropriators will be found. The business of expropriation will therefore undoubtedly become more and more difficult !

(4) *The Theory of Pauperization* asserts that the intellectual and material condition of the proletariat under the capitalist system, instead of improving, grows constantly worse and worse. That was the view of Marx and Engels, but their most devoted followers have had to give it up. For the view is too obviously contradicted by facts, at any rate so far as one can judge by the conditions of life prevailing among wage-earners. It is, of course, difficult to ascertain how much truth there is in the talk about "oppression, slavery and exploitation," and whether these are increasing or decreasing. It is difficult because there is no common standard by which to measure these things, which, indeed, are largely a matter of personal opinion. I myself believe that morally there is a good deal of truth in this theory of pauperization. For the more the working classes rise intellectually, the more keenly are they likely to feel the burden of "oppression," "slavery," and "exploitation." And so when the attempt is made to explain the theory in this sense, i. e. psychologically, there is nothing to be said against it. The question, however, is whether Marx and Engels did not lend the theory a material meaning. It would seem that they did. Let us recall the passage already quoted: "The modern worker, instead of rising with the advance of industry, sinks deeper and deeper because of the conditions which his own class impose upon him. The worker becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops even more quickly than population or wealth." That is quite untrue. The condition of the working classes is raised in the course of capitalist development, probably more slowly than that of the other classes of the population, but, at any rate, raised it is. That is abundantly apparent in the researches recently made into this subject.

Thus, in France, an official inquiry of the *Office du Travail* showed that wages had been doubled since 1850; they rose for women workers from 1'02 francs to 2'20 francs, for men, from 2'07 francs to 4 francs. The cost of living has not increased by more than twenty-five per cent.

In the case of England, Sidney Webb believes that between 1837 and 1897 money wages have doubled. The price of food, on the other hand (with the exception of meat and milk), was even lower in the latter year than in the former. Only rent has risen. "But this rise in rent is nothing like the rise in the wages of skilled labourers; their weekly wages make it possible for them and their families to enjoy more comfort and civilization than ever their grandfathers could." It is true that the same authority is of opinion that there were more people in England in 1897 living in extreme poverty than there were in 1837. This may be so; but it has not been proved, since there are no official figures in England in reference to incomes. Sidney Webb based his view on the estimate of Charles Booth.

The facts are the same in Germany. There is no doubt that the majority of the working classes are better off than they were fifty or one hundred years ago, and that the proportion of the very poor of the population is smaller, certainly during the last decade or so. In Saxony, for example, in 1879 the people with an income less than 500 Mk. (£25) formed 51'51 per cent. of the population, in 1894 they were only 36'59 per cent., in 1900 only 28'29 per cent. In Prussia in 1892, people with an income less than 900 Mk. (£45) formed 70'27 per cent. of the population, in 1900 they were 62'41 per cent., in 1906 only 56'2 per cent.

Lastly, it is certainly incorrect to say that "pauperism develops even more quickly than population or wealth." In England, which was generally uppermost in the mind of Marx, and which for him was the best example of a country organized on a capitalist basis, the number of

paupers has steadily decreased, and that in face of an improved poor law system. Pauperism declined from 918,966, as an average per annum in the years 1871 to 1875, to 787,144 in the years 1891 to 1895; that is to say, from being 3.93 per cent. of the total population to 2.65 per cent. The number of paupers in the United Kingdom during the last decade has remained constant, though in proportion to the population it has declined somewhat. It was 26.4 per cent. of the population as an average per annum in the period 1889-1893; in the period 1900 to 1904 it was 24.5 per cent. Poor relief between 1870 and 1900 decreased in the whole of England and Wales to the extent of 23 per cent., in London to the extent of 19.5 per cent., and in Whitechapel, where poverty is great, to the extent of 60.8 per cent.

(5) *The theory of self-destruction* asserts that Capitalism is digging its own grave. The occurrence of commercial crises, coming as they do with constantly increasing force, proves conclusively the failure of the prevailing economic system to maintain its predominance. The crises are the symptoms of the bankruptcy of the existing social order; and one day they will become so extensive that recovery will become quite impossible. Let me say at once that the present state of our knowledge on the subject of crises does not allow of the assertion that this theory is incorrect. The attempts of Tugan-Baranowski to prove that the theory is wrong have certainly not convinced me. And his have been as yet the only attempts to overthrow the Marxian theory of crises. My own view is that the periodic crises which Marx had in mind are not special phenomena characteristic of the capitalist system; they are accidental complications arising after periods of commercial prosperity. What the capitalist economic system produces are rather chronic periods of depression, like those we had from the middle of the eighteen-seventies to the end of the eighteen-eighties. But this depression vanishes the moment there is a more even flow in the production of the precious metals. It would not neces-

sarily follow that "the symptoms of disease," as Marx and Engels described them, would appear, and so we cannot say that Capitalism is digging its own grave. It would be more correct to say that it was preparing its bed of sickness. That would not necessarily mean death, for Capitalism might go on living for an unlimited length of time. We know to-day, for observation has proved it, that the crises which Marx and Engels had in mind, namely, the backward swing of the pendulum after a period of prosperity, rather lose than gain in intensity. Capitalism never enjoyed so prosperous a period as that from the middle of the eighteen-nineties to the end of the century. And yet the reaction which came about in 1900—the first for the last twenty-five years—was milder than ever before. Of all the terrors which Marx and Engels described as a result of their experiences in the crises of 1836, 1847, 1857 and 1873, only very few reappeared in the years 1900 and after, so that it is doubtful whether we can talk of a crisis in the old sense when thinking of the economic disturbances of the last few years. The improved organization of our banking system has made it impossible for the evils which usually followed in the wake of previous crises to reappear.

III. SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM SUPERSEDED

The conviction that much of the teaching of Marx is not in accord with scientific facts, and that therefore they are erroneous, must have led to conflicts in the soul of many an orthodox Socialist who regarded himself as a follower of Marx. At first there were attempts at all manner of explanations and interpretations of doubtful passages in order to silence criticism. But in the long run these attempts were of little use. It had to be admitted in the end that Marx had made mistakes on many points of importance. The faithful Marxist was then placed in the same position as the believing Chris-

tian when natural science undermined some of the conceptions of the universe taught in the Bible. He, too, had to choose between surrendering his faith, expressed as this was in forms which science had proved to be untenable, or not acknowledging the teaching of science in order to save his faith. In either case it was a difficult question, and the Socialist did exactly what the Christian had done. He realized that for him hitherto faith and knowledge, science and his outlook on life, had been very closely intertwined. He realized that all faith, whether it be faith in God or faith in a political ideal, cannot be based on science; and that the criticism of science cannot enter the heart, the abiding place of all faith and all ideals. He perceived that the power of Socialism could not possibly depend on the scientific theories of single individuals, even though they be so important as Marx and Engels; but that this power draws its strength from the passions and the will to achieve, which are born anew in face of the contrast between the world as it is in reality and as it might be if human ideals were made actual.

That was a step forward in the criticism of Marxian doctrine. It was no longer a question of criticizing or supporting any particular set of theories—in this case the Marxian theory of evolution—but rather of doubting the whole method of Marx. Marx was desirous of putting a "scientific," in place of the "Utopian," Socialism. But it was now apparent that such a policy was not wise. The extreme importance of the system of Marx, in so far as Socialism is concerned, did not lie in the fact that it was "scientific," but rather in that he showed how the Social Movement was the result of historic development, and was based on self-interest—both of which had little to do with the scientific spirit as such. But his attempt to show by scientific proofs that Socialism was a necessary phenomenon in the world's development was abortive. You can never prove by scientific arguments that any social effort, any struggle for a new order which is yet to be created, is right. Scientific considerations are

limited to showing cause and effect in the world of realities. They go beyond their province when they attempt to prove that a demand, the realization of which lies in the future, is a right one, or even to assert that it is necessary. Any practical movement must, of course, profit by utilizing the established results of science. But no movement of this kind can be spoken of as scientific. Its justification is not that it is "true," but rather that it is "useful" and "powerful." "Scientific Socialism" is a contradiction in terms. And so to separate Socialism from science was of the utmost importance; only by so doing would each receive a due share of attention.

But the new school of Socialists did not stop at this point in their efforts at emancipation. When once the Socialist confession of faith has been sundered from science, it was but a logical consequence to carry the separation farther into their whole view of life. The criticism of Marx coincided with the attempts to separate the prevailing view of life from the natural sciences.

In both cases the main issue was to mark off the limits of science—of natural science in the one case, and of social science in the other; to show that science goes beyond its province when it sets up new values for the world of ideals and of faith. What above all else was desired was to rescue religious conviction from the claws of science. But with this development there was a total change in the position of the Socialists towards the problems of religion. There is no doubt that until recently the modern Socialist was an anti-religionist. There were political grounds for that. There was not a sufficiently clear distinction made between religion and Churches. And as, on the whole, the Churches, at any rate on the continent, identified themselves with the prevailing monarchical and capitalist system, the Socialists transferred their hate of all Church institutions to God Almighty. The blame for this must surely rest on the servants of the Churches, who defended the capitalist system in His name. That at any rate was one reason

for the anti-religious position of the Socialists. But there were others of a more personal kind. The Socialists believed that to be faithful in all things, they must swallow the Marxian view of life, neck and crop. Now in this view of life, religious problems were but little regarded; indeed, it is perhaps not too much to say that religion was regarded with hatred. This is not very remarkable when we recall the period in which the views of Marx matured, and more especially the influence of Feuerbach in that period. The Marxian view of life was enveloped in the cloak of science, and science from its very nature laid down objective truth. Now since atheism was looked upon as one of these truths, it was felt to be sacrilege against Socialism and science (the two were still regarded as one) if you dared to question the truth of atheism. But when the general view of life was freed from the trammels of science, the position of the individual with regard to religion became independent. Then men perceived that science and Socialism had nothing to do with each other, any more than science and religion or Socialism and religion, or, indeed, religion and the Churches; and to-day, if views inimical to religion are expressed in socialist circles, it is only among the more ignorant and uncultivated of them. Thus, when the socialist theorists cut themselves loose from the Marxian system their minds were at ease once more.

The attempts of the theoretical speculators to free Socialism from the Marxian system found support in the camp of the practical Socialists. In the long run that system was more of a hindrance than a help to the forward march of the Social Movement. It is true that for a generation or so the system had been of enormous and far-reaching importance for the practical application of socialist ideas. The theory that Socialism was bound to come, like some unpreventable natural phenomenon; that to spread its teaching was to spread the "truth," gave the Social Movement a propelling force such that it could not otherwise have obtained. The theory strengthened

the belief in the ultimate triumph of the cause, and gave a certain confidence to the bearing of the socialist parties; it hastened the first consolidation of the modern proletarian movement.

But in the course of time people saw that a heavy price was being paid for all these benefits; that the theory of Marx was lessening the potentialities for idealism in the movement. For the more Socialists accustomed themselves "to prove" the "necessity" of Socialism by means of "scientific" arguments, the more they lost the power of creating new ideals and the possibility of intense feeling. It was as though having become so cramped by their straight waistcoat, they were unable to move freely. Marx and Engels were both gifted with wonderful intellectual abilities, but these were so great that they seem not to have left any room for imagination. There is not the least hint in their system of any picture of the society of the future. This was due partly to their aversion to all Utopias, but partly also to their lack of creative power. The consequence was that their system had a deadening effect on all ideal tendencies. In their view, neither ideals nor deep feeling were necessary, since the scientific nature of Socialism had no room for them. Only the power of analysis was of use. The working classes "have no ideals to be realized; all that they need is to set free the elements of the new order of society which are already developed within the tottering fabric of existing society."

That was the cheerless rôle which "scientific Socialism" set before the proletariat. The historian of Socialism will not be able to restrain a sigh of regret as he turns over the pages of Fourier, of Weitling, of Lassalle and the rest, and compares with these writers what the Socialist literature of to-day produces. Everything has become matter of fact, conventional, self-evident, and practical! He may perhaps still come across a revolutionary phrase here and there, but no one believes in it any longer. It is all ink; red ink if you like, but still ink and not life-blood.

Of course the Marxian system is not wholly to be held

accountable for this. The Social Movement, like all else, has had to pay its tribute to the spirit of the age. Poetry and Art are to-day no longer of the very highest kind; they have not the force and the feeling which characterizes work of the first order. Besides, the Social Movement is progressing in years; it is more matured and is becoming more reasonable, and therefore mere words and phrases have not the attraction they used to have. All this may be admitted. Nevertheless, the fact is that the Marxian spirit had robbed it of its ideal contents to a greater degree than the other factors. It is true, of course, that the Social Movement cannot pass Marx by and revert to the Utopian views of its childhood; it is true that if it expects to receive recognition it must continue to rest on the basis which Marx laid down—namely, on the realistic, historic basis; it is true that the supporters of Socialism may continue to draw strength from the fact that the more modern economic life develops, the more do the conditions increase by which the capitalist organization of society will be changed into one on socialist lines. All this is true, but it need not prevent the adoption, side by side with the rational, matter-of-fact conceptions of social problems, of a more intense view, one in which imagination and ideals may play a part, one from which intense feeling is not absent. There is far too much realism in the modern Social Movement. What it requires is a little more idealization. But the way to this is blocked by the method of Marx, or by its application.

There is no need to adopt the view of the anarchists, who may also be regarded as idealist reactionaries. There is no need to believe that "what is of concern to us is not what is possible and what impossible; but only what is true, what is just, what is beautiful. The idea is everything" (Jean Grave). This is as unsatisfactory as the other extreme. The ideal, no doubt, lies between the two. Not only what is possible ought to be of concern to us, but also—and perhaps chiefly—what is just and what is beautiful. There is no occasion to say that the idea is

everything. It is much truer to say: without the idea all attempts to bring about the new are colourless. Without the inspiration of the idea we creep about on the face of the earth, with it we are able to fly untrammelled as high as the heavens. The ideas give body to our ideals, and the ideals must fill us with enthusiasm. We must keep them alive in the heart's flames and temper them in the fire of the soul. Ideals are like the sun's rays—an absolute necessity for all things that have life. The last words of St. Simon to his favourite disciple Rodrigues remain true for ever: "My friend, never forget that you must be an enthusiast if you wish to achieve great things." And so a movement which can no longer stir up the enthusiasm of its followers is apt to become petty, apt to spend its energy on paltry matters, to develop into a mere party organization, and then the end is not far off. One is disheartened to notice that some among the leaders of the proletarian movement appear to have lost that faculty for enthusiasm amid the encounters of everyday hostilities, and to have sunk into the position of mere wire-pullers.

I may be asked: how can Socialism keep the realistic and historic character with which Marx stamped it and at the same time be filled with that enthusiasm for which there is such great need? Would not this be attempting to make an impossible combination? Are not the ethical and idealistic spirits opposed to the theory of evolution, which must continue to remain the basis of Socialism? Are they not opposed because they desire to form the future in accordance with the picture in our own minds, instead of allowing it to develop as "the stars determine"?

I believe there is no such opposition if the word evolution is rightly understood. In Marxian circles it very often happens that evolution is mistaken for fatalism, and the history of mankind is not kept sufficiently distinct from natural processes. People believe that historical evolution is quite independent of the action of man, and that therefore the individual may fold his hands and wait

for the expected fruit to ripen. But as a matter of fact, such fatalism has nothing in common with the theory of evolution. A view like this overlooks the fundamental fact that all social phenomena affect, and are brought about by, living people, and that these people bring about development by setting themselves an aim and trying to realize it.

All this is due to the confusion between the different standpoints of the social theorist, and of the practical man who is himself an agent in social life. The former regards social development as the result of active causes; he deduces the actual from the motives of men; he seeks to understand these motives. For him social life is a process of the past, and therefore he can make himself acquainted with its growth. But for the politician, social life is something uncertain, something which is yet to be formed in the future. What the theorist looks upon as the resultant purpose of any particular phenomenon, the politician holds to be the distant goal which is to be reached by the exercise of his will. But this will is a necessary link in the chain of causation. Yet, necessary though it is, it is the personal possession of the acting individual. From the standpoint of the practical man, who is primarily engaged in discovering purposes, his will is free; in that of the theorist, who speculates on the motives of action, it is not free. When the theorist lays down certain social forms as being necessary for the future, he does so on the assumption that the will-power of the agents in the process of development remains as effective as hitherto. If through any cause (*e. g.* a powerful wave of Quietism) the energy in question should become less powerful than before, one of the most important links in the chain of causation would be affected, and the course of development would be very different in consequence. It is absurd to apply to social life the notion of natural processes acting automatically; to say that Socialism must come as an absolute necessity. There is no absolute necessity. It is just as possible to imagine that the development of

Capitalism may result in the complete break-up of modern civilization, or, as indeed an American writer recently prophesied, it may perhaps restore the feudal system on a capitalist basis. These or similar results would be quite within the bounds of possibility, if the proletariat, the army of the Social Movement, did not go on developing the characteristics required for the new order of society. If from the point of view of the proletariat any particular social development is desirable for the future, it must be actively brought about, and to bring it about willing efforts and energetic decisions are necessary.

The apparent contradiction between evolution and idealism, which we are now discussing, is due also to the confusion between an ideal and a party programme, between the means and the end, between faith and politics. All these must clearly be kept separate. The one appeals to our hearts, the other to our minds. Enthusiasm for the ends in view must go side by side with clearness of vision in the practical affairs of politics. For the one we need warm feelings, for the other a clear outlook, so that ways and means for arriving at the wished-for goal may be plainly perceived.

Only when we have grasped the differences between these two aspects of the case shall we be able to combine enthusiastic idealism with sober political sense. Both are necessary. Just as to carry out the party programme without a dash of idealism in it becomes a dull, paltry, commonplace activity, so to have an ideal but no programme is deliberately to throw away chances of making the most of political possibilities. Only he who has succeeded in separating the means from the end will clearly realize what strenuous efforts will have to be made before the possibility to do without the aid of political machinery becomes unnecessary. And on the other hand, only he who has grasped the innermost meaning of the ideal will look upon it as the cheering light on a weary way, will understand the necessity for walking step by step, will understand the slow changes of evolution.

The best Socialists of our age see all this most clearly. And so a tendency to develop away from Marx has shown itself. It already has many supporters among Socialists in all lands, although those who openly declare their support are as yet few in number. But those who have been most filled with the spirit of Marx have become the leaders in this struggle for liberation. They are not by any means renegades; we ought rather to say they have realized the historical limitations of the Marxian system. They do not oppose Marx; they do not wish to fall behind him; all they want is to go beyond him. *Amicus Marx, sed magis amicus socialismus*. They are anxious to prevent the great work which Marx commenced from being destroyed by Marx himself. In the words of George D. Herron, one of the American Socialists who supports the new tendency, "The Socialist Revolution will not come about by the mere repetition of the doctrines of Marx. The working classes were not made for a particular socialist theory, but the theory was made for the working classes. No one was more zealous than Engels in his attempts to show the necessity of bringing socialist phraseology into accord with existing circumstances, and this we, too, must learn to do. Socialism cannot come simply because it is orthodox, or because it is the faith of a sect; it must burst forth as a fresh stream of life."

For the present, however, people are groping in the dark, for there is no one yet who is able to shed the light of new and vital ideals on the way of the proletariat.

And so there is a wavering backwards and forwards between thoughtless opportunism, old ideals such as the Christian or humanitarian, and the new ones of bringing about revolutions. No one can tell what it will all lead to.

Meanwhile a new gospel has arisen within the last few years, which has so criticized and attacked the system of Marx that this has been reduced to worthless fragments. Many excellent people have set their hopes on the new

gospel, and are waiting for it to hasten the dawn of the new day; they see in it the true signs of promise.

The world of ideas here referred to is sufficiently interesting for us to consider it fully. But it also has a sufficiently independent individuality of its own in its criticism of Marx to be treated by itself. We shall, therefore, devote a new chapter to the new theory.

It has been called Revolutionary Syndicalism.

CHAPTER V

REVOLUTIONARY SYNDICALISM

I. ITS MEANING

THE name of the new movement at once attracts attention. In English, or in German, it does not express as full a meaning as in the Romance language, where syndicates (*Syndicats, sindacati*) are always taken to mean syndicates of workmen; the words *ouvriers, operari* are always understood. Perhaps the best term in English is "Trade-union." But the name is, after all, of secondary importance. Our first object must be to make ourselves acquainted with what the movement stands for, so far as that is possible. For it is no easy task, since the new set of doctrines is not yet wholly complete. (I must ask to be allowed to call the views of the leaders of the movement by the term "doctrines," although, as we shall see, they object very strongly to being regarded as the exponents of a new theory.) The system, then, is not yet quite complete. Many among its followers have not made up their minds even on questions of vital importance, to say nothing of lesser matters; and on certain points of detail they are even at variance with one another. It is clear, therefore, that my account of the new movement must be regarded as by no means final.

The new theory first arose in France. It was transplanted thence to Italy, and it has struck root in its new home. There are but few who profess the new doctrine in other countries, and even then they are mostly either Frenchmen or Italians. So far as my personal acquaintance with them goes, they are good-natured, gentlemanly, cultured people; people with spotless linen, good manners and fashionably-dressed wives; people with whom one

holds social intercourse as with one's equals; people who would at first sight hardly be taken as the representatives of a new movement whose object it is to prevent Socialism from becoming a mere middle-class belief; people who are enthusiastic in the desire to help the horny-handed sons of toil to obtain what is their due.

The books to which one may refer for information on the new movement are not numerous. I believe the first publication which dealt with it was a book by Georges Sorel, published in 1897--*L'avenir Socialiste des Syndicats*. Sorel has since then developed and extended his theory in other books and essays, and to-day he ranks as the Marx of the new doctrines. Indeed, we are already beginning to hear of "Sorelism." His last book, which appeared in 1907, has the significant title, *Degenerazione Capitalistica e Degenerazione Socialista* (The Degeneration of Capitalism and Socialism). Sorel has probably been much influenced by the work of Pelloutier, whose *Histoire des Bourses du Travail* (1902) he published, with a lengthy introduction of his own, after the author's all too early death. Sorel is a member of the staff of *Le Mouvement Socialiste*, a paper founded in 1899 by Hubert Lagardelle, which to-day is the organ of the syndicalist movement in France, and here Sorel has set forth his views in numerous essays. The editor of this paper, and some of its contributors, viz. Edward Berth and V. Griffuelhes (President of the Confédération Générale du Travail), are among the most skilful exponents of the new doctrines in France.

In Italy, also, the system has been enthusiastically received by Socialists of note. Among them no two young men are more distinguished for their intellectual gifts and their hard work than Arturo Labriola and Enrico Leone, and both have expressed their views in books and in newspaper articles--Labriola in his *Riforma e Rivoluzione Sociale* (1904) and in the *Avanguardia* up to 1907, and since then in the *Pagine Libere*; and Leone in his book, *Il Sindacalismo* (1907), and in the *Divenire Sociale* (published in Rome since 1906).

Among German Socialists, only Robert Michels has, to my knowledge, declared himself a follower of the new doctrines. (If it is not possible to include the anarchist-socialist views of Friedeberg and other German "Localists" in this category.) Michels has now permanently settled in Italy, and as he does not attach much importance to his German birth, and publishes his propagandist essays in French and Italian papers only, we are justified in classing him with the Italian and French writers.

What are the syndicalist theories? What is it that binds them into a whole?

The first points of importance in the syndicalist doctrines is criticism—criticism of the prevailing tendencies of the socialist movement. This criticism starts with the fact, which the syndicalist leaders think they observe, that Socialism is about to degenerate; that is to say, it appears to them to be shallow, weak and conventional; in a word, it is showing signs of sinking into a mere bourgeois belief. It appears to be on the verge of losing its old revolutionary force, and of becoming a reform movement without any very definite principles. This is all due to the policy of directing Socialism into the channels of political and parliamentary activity. In such activity the syndicalist leaders perceive the seeds of decay which are undermining the socialist movement of our time. They believe that a movement caught up in the wheels of the parliamentary machine must of necessity decline both as to the extent of its following and as to the intensity of its views. It must decline as to the extent of its following because the policy of participation in parliamentary activity produces of necessity the desire to have many candidates and many members, and, consequently, many votes. This leads to a slackening of principle, so as to include as many followers as possible, some of whom may be only lukewarm supporters of true Socialism. Any labour movement which enters the arena of parliamentary elections must gradually tend to become a popular democratic party, "to degenerate into democracy," because it will be

unable to withstand the temptation "of representing the interests of all those strata of the population that are about to be, or are already, submerged!" But by so doing it ceases to be a labour party, the representative of a special class "caring only for the interests of the wage-earners."

In the same way it must decline in the intensity of its views. For once represented in Parliament, the movement will strive to obtain as much political influence as possible. It can do that only by a policy of opportunism; it will be ready for compromise; that is to say, it will be prepared to give up important principles here and there, if by so doing it is assured of success on lesser points.

And so the Syndicalists look upon Revisionism, Reform, Millerandism—call it what you will—as the necessary result of the participation of the Labour movement in politics. But at least they believe the "Revisionists" to be honest and consistent—which is more than they believe of the orthodox followers of Marx. These, they say, have betrayed the cause of the working classes and of revolution just as much as the Millerandists, but they have not been honest about it, because they still pay lip-service to the revolutionary idea.

Lastly, the Syndicalists fear that if the proletarian movement takes part in politics, a sort of ruling caste will be formed, and in this they see a danger. For these leaders may gradually lose touch with the proletariat, and so become incapable of understanding and representing the feelings and the wishes of the working classes. Indeed, they fear that such a ruling caste may conceivably become inimical to the Labour movement, since the latter strives to abolish the conditions which make exploitation possible, while the former, whose leadership is a matter of political wire-pulling, have their interests bound up with such conditions, seeing that if these were abolished, there would be no further need for their services. This is a favourite idea of Lagardelle's.

The decay of Socialism is to be deplored, both from the point of view of the working classes and also from that of

humanity in general. The working classes run the risk of having their special class interests neglected, for the socialist party has made its peace with God and man. The world at large would also be the worse for such a contingency. For the proletariat would be prevented from fulfilling the mission assigned to it by history, the mission of filling the world with a new spirit, so that the world may become young again, and cure itself of its ills. I must say, though, that the syndicalist literature has not yet attempted to show how this healing is to come about.

Political Socialism has not anything of this nature to offer. It is nothing more nor less than a continuation of what already is, an extension of our present civilization. It has no power to strike a new note, no power to demand a complete re-moulding of things. And it is this alone which could stir up our interest and make us care for it.

The Social Movement at the present time, then, is threatened by serious dangers, and, if it is to be saved, there is no other course left but to withdraw it from the influence of political Socialism, and reconstitute it once more as a class movement whose aim it shall be to safeguard the interests of the proletariat. This it can do only by the abolition of the capitalist system, and especially of production on capitalist lines. But to achieve this end it must return to its own methods of warfare.

For political Socialism, being in all things but a development of Capitalism, has adopted the method of warfare characteristic of Capitalism and of its representative, the bourgeoisie. It has organized itself into a political party. But a political party can only serve the ends of the middle classes; for the proletariat it is useless. The proletariat needs the trade-union or the workers' syndicate. Accordingly, if the Social Movement is again to become a purely proletarian movement, it will be necessary to throw aside the party organization and adopt that of the trade-union—a proletarian institution in the best sense.

The new tendency calls itself Syndicalism, just because it strives to establish the proletarian movement on a

trade-union basis, instead of on socialist dogmas. In the words of Lagardelle, "The Socialism of Institutions (trade-unions, co-operative societies) is developing more and more, as opposed to party Socialism, with its weakness and artificiality."

But the trade-union has another merit in addition to being the best agency for safeguarding proletarian interests: it serves as a model of those social units, by the combination of which the society of the future will be formed. The separate unions will combine into federations having their centre at the *Bourses du Travail* (Labour Exchanges), and will thus show the way in which the new organization of society is to proceed. The *Bourses du Travail* will become, in the words of Sorel, "the administrative centres of the slowly-growing proletarian community."

It is a chimera to believe that the new order will ever be brought about by the nationalization or municipalization of things. No expectation is more foolish. For it is overlooked that if State and municipal control became general, production on capitalist lines, and the social structure corresponding to it, would still continue. The hierarchy of officials in each factory and business would remain, only there would be a superior State or municipal hierarchy placed over them. This would in reality be no gain, since the object of the Social Movement is to abolish every hierarchy, whether in the single factory or in the State. There is, therefore, but one course open, and that is to allow the independent trade-unions to carry on production, not suffering the State to interfere in the least with their activity. The only purpose served by the State at present is to regulate the intercourse of the individual units engaged in the work of production, and to carry out its regulations by the aid of the force behind it, in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Under the new conditions there would be no necessity for the existence of the State.

Such, broadly speaking, are the tendencies of the

Syndicalists. But, it may be asked, how will the change from the capitalist to the socialist organization of society come about? Certainly not along the lines laid down by the doctrines of Marx; that is to say, by way of a gradual, almost automatic, development of the existing order into the socialist order. The Syndicalists have as little faith in the process of accumulation, or in that of concentration, as in the pauperization of the masses.¹ On the contrary, they rather believe (Labriola more especially) that the elements necessary for bringing about the social revolution develop best in periods of prosperity.

What are these elements? In reality there is but one motive force which is at the same time creative, and that is the will of the proletariat to revolutionize the old conditions of production and of society by direct efforts, and by readiness for self-sacrifice. That is the source from which all possibilities of improvement must spring. "The success of the social revolution depends chiefly on the will of the revolutionary class. The proletariat must depend on itself alone for the strength necessary to bring about that revolution."

From the same source, too, there flow possibilities for organizing production on new lines, production based on a new morality which teaches the necessity of unselfish sacrifices in the interests of the whole. It is something of the spirit which actuated the soldiers in the Revolutionary Army in the years 1792 to 1794, where each man knew nothing higher than to do his duty for duty's sake, and also for the sake of liberty, which he thought imperilled, without any expectation of personal reward.

It is on resolute determination, on enthusiasm, and on active work, that Syndicalism bases its hope for the future. Its text is not "In the beginning was the *Word*," i. e. theory, or doctrine, or dogma, but rather "In the beginning was the *Deed*." Or, as Leone expresses it: "Syndicalism is something essentially practical. It lives by deeds. Action is its root principle and its real essence."

¹ Cf. p. 74 ff.

It does not wait for history; it wants to make history. That is its philosophy in a nutshell."

The practical politics of Syndicalism follow quite easily from its philosophy. Everything that weakens the "will to revolution" must be avoided. And so, above all else, the Syndicalists are concerned about the development of trade-unions. Seeing that these are to be the organizations of the revolutionary movement, nothing could be more injurious to the cause of the revolution than for the trade-unions to be influenced by a middle-class spirit. But such will be the case if what are called trade-union politics prevail. The whole tendency is seen in the case of English trade-unions, with their funds, their arbitration and conciliation boards, their sliding-scales and so forth. The wealthy trade-unions become anxious, and are afraid of strikes; they tend to shut out the poorer classes of workers and to become narrow. And so the Syndicalists advocate the formation of trade-unions for whole industries rather than for individual callings in any one particular industry; rather a large Ironworkers' Union than unions of boilermakers and steelworkers and engineers. Their policy is to attempt to bring these large unions into federations, in order to combat any narrowing tendencies. For that reason they would do away with contributions, and with strike-funds or insurance-funds, and they will hear nothing of making terms with masters. In the same way, they object to any policy which makes for social peace—to compromise in parliaments, to social reform, to humanitarian institutions which are due to the "social spirit," and which serve to keep that spirit alive. Indeed, they will have none of the "nonsensical talk about humanitarianism." It is war to the knife that they preach. They believe that that alone is capable of maintaining the creative force not only of the worker but also of the employer. For the latter degenerates and becomes lazy when there is no opposition to face. The result is that economic progress, to which the workers look for so much, is retarded. The prole-

tarian policy of violence is therefore in the interests of human progress. "It is of the utmost importance to continue the struggle in these days when so many efforts are being made to counteract Socialism by social peace." That is the conclusion of Sorel, based on his review of the part which force has played in history.

On the other hand, it is vital to help forward everything that tends to strengthen the "will to revolution," to lay stress on all that accentuates the class differences between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and to stir up the hatred of the proletariat against the existing condition of things. The most effective means for doing all this today are strikes. Every time a strike occurs, the antagonism between proletariat and bourgeoisie breaks out afresh, and class hatred is fanned into flame. At the same time, strikes bring out in the proletariat just those qualities that are needful to produce the social revolution and establish the new order—solidarity, self-sacrifice and enthusiasm. Of course, a strike must not be a business-like matter, entered upon after weighing the advantages and disadvantages; it must burst out spontaneously as a result of the provocation of the masses. Nor must it be dependent upon the carefully-saved subscriptions of the workers. It must draw its strength entirely from the capacity to make sacrifices; and as to assistance, it must look to the support of other groups of workers who are prepared voluntarily to help those on strike.

Any strike is thus a means of kindling revolutionary passions, but the general strike, the *grève générale*, serves such a purpose in the highest degree. In the general strike there is no possibility of a narrow outlook, no petty thoughts of success for each individual union concerned. The proletariat appears on the scene as a class. It is no longer a case of a body of workers fighting against their employers; it is warfare between class and class. Whenever there is a general strike, it is as though another decisive move were made in the direction of victory. For clearly the means of production can only pass from the

possession of the capitalist undertaking class into the hands of the proletariat as a result of a general strike. Indeed, the general strike is regarded by the Syndicalists as the symbol of the social revolution; for them, it is equivalent to Socialism. As Sorel says: "The day is perhaps not so far distant when the best definition of Socialism will be 'General Strike.'"

Now, it is to be expected that in the great struggle the State will side with the Capitalists, and so be a hindrance to the proletariat. Accordingly, in order to hasten the arrival of the new age, and to make its path as smooth as possible, the old machinery of the State will have to be demolished. All that tends to this result must be heartily welcomed. The first thing that suggests itself is the army. The capitalist State relies to a very great extent on its army, and therefore the power of the army must be undermined. This is the aim of the propaganda of anti-militarism. The gospel of anti-militarism stands thus closely connected with Syndicalism; indeed, it is not too much to say that anti-militarism is an organic part of Syndicalism.

So much, then, for the new doctrines, which have been presented, I hope, without prejudice and without comment. It is time now to pass some opinion on this new phase of Socialism, and to measure its influence on the theory and practice of the social movement.

II. ITS ORIGIN

Our first question concerning this strange system of revolutionary Syndicalism must be, What school of thought has it sprung from? The answer to this question may throw some light on its special characteristics.

We may gain much if we attempt to seek for some bond of connection between Syndicalism and the older socialist theories.

We are met at once by the view, held by the Syndicalists themselves, that their system is no new one; that it is nothing more nor less than a revival of Marxian teaching in a pure form. The Syndicalists believe that the Marxian doctrines required to be polished in order to appear in their true beauty and purity, and so they have removed everything from them that tended to dim their brightness. In the opinion of the Syndicalists, these accretions are the work of Engels and others; they hold, for example, that peaceful methods of bringing about the social changes which are to lead to the new order owe their existence entirely to Engels. On the other hand, their view is that Syndicalism is a true child of Marx; that its central idea—"The emancipation of the working classes can only be achieved by their own efforts"—is thoroughly Marxian in spirit. The same, they say, applies to the belief that great changes can be brought about by force alone. They regard themselves simply as Marxists; they believe that their intense revolutionary feeling, their striving after a radical upheaval (on which they lay so much stress), is traceable to the doctrines of Marx. These doctrines, they hold, were revolutionary through and through, and Marx was in no way an opportunist Revisionist, *i. e.* an advocate of the parliamentary machine for bringing about social changes. If Marx were to reappear in the world to-morrow, he would, they believe, most certainly disown as renegades those who are leading the socialist parties in the parliaments of Europe.

As might be expected, orthodox Marxists are ready with their answer. They, in their turn, assert that Syndicalism is not really Socialism, but Anarchism. In a number of reports on the development of the Social Movement in different lands, which were sent to the central International Bureau at Brussels, the whole syndicalist theory and practice is described as the latest trick of the Anarchists.

What is actually the case? Have the Syndicalists the right to call themselves the only true Marxists?

There is no doubt that their doctrines are filled to a great degree with the spirit of Marx. I believe that my own presentation of the Marxian system must give support to the contention of the Syndicalists. Thus, the very clear distinction between the proletariat and other lower social strata, on which the Syndicalists lay so much stress, is thoroughly Marxian, and the revolutionary colouring of their whole system is at least early Marxian. Other points of contact might easily be added. But on the other hand, there are ingredients in the syndicalist system which I am unable to bring into accord with any views held by Marx, whether in his earlier or in his later period. I am unable to discover in the Marxian teaching any express refusal to participate in parliamentary action. I believe that "direct action," the idea on which the whole syndicalist system is based, is actually opposed to the doctrine of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, which Marx never positively gave up. Of course, it may be that the Syndicalists regard this particular theory as not really a characteristic of Marxian teaching, just as I myself have done in the previous chapter. But if that is so, their whole conception of the Marxian system would be diametrically opposed to their other principles, more especially to their faith in revolution.

We are forced to the conclusion that Syndicalism has no doubt taken many stones from the ruined Marxian structure with which to build up its own, but that it has also used material from other sources. There is no doubt that Anarchism has contributed a share, as, indeed, its orthodox opponents assert, and as Syndicalists and Anarchists themselves both admit. Where else could they have got such ideas as that of opposition to parliamentary activity, of direct action (*i. e.* revolution) and of a decentralized commonwealth of the future, resting on the autonomy of single groups of workers?

To the Marxian and anarchist doctrines have been added many others of great importance, taken from other systems. Thus, Enrico Leone advocates many trade-

union principles, and Edward Berth follows in the footsteps of Proudhon.

The truth is that we must regard the syndicalist system as a mixture of different elements.

In reality, however, it is of no great consequence to trace any social theory to its source in the history of thought. What is of much greater importance, it seems to me, is to account for the theory by considering the conditions amid which it arose, to look upon it as the result of a certain national, social and political environment.

Let us recall the fact that the new theory first arose in France, and, up to the present, has taken root nowhere else except in Italy. This is not accidental. On closer observation we shall see that Syndicalism is something specially Franco-Italian, or perhaps more exactly French, and that it could not have developed in any other land.

To begin with, the character of the French people has influenced Syndicalism in no small measure. I believe that a theory of this kind could only have grown up in a country possessing so high a culture as France; that it could have been thought out only by minds of the nicest perception, by people who have become quite *blasé*, whose feelings require a very strong stimulus before they can be stirred; people who have something of the artistic temperament, and consequently look disdainfully on what has been called "Philistinism"—on business, on middle-class ideals and so forth. They are, as it were, the fine silk as contrasted with the plain wool of ordinary people. They detest the common everyday round as much as they hate what is natural; they might be called "Social Sybarites." Such are the people who have created the syndicalist system.

Moreover, the only people who could possibly act up to such a system of teaching are Frenchmen or Italians. They are generally men who do things impulsively and on the spur of the moment, men who are seized upon by a sudden passionate enthusiasm, which moves their inmost being and forces them to act at once, men who

possess a vast fund of emotion, showing itself quickly and suddenly; but they have little application, perseverance, calm or steadiness.

Syndicalism would be inexplicable without reference to the peculiar history of France. As I hope to show in detail below, that history is predominated by memories of the Revolution; so much so, that at every opportunity the events of that remarkable period are recalled. And hence it is that the Syndicalists have the old cry still: "The revolutionary cause is being betrayed, and we must hasten to its help." In their view, the idea of the social revolution of to-day corresponds to the revolution of 1792 and 1793. As in those days, so in these, there is a hunt for traitors and "aristocrats."

There is yet to be considered the social and economic environment in which the syndicalist doctrines arose, and which must have influenced them to a great extent. I am inclined to say that the fundamental conception of the future commonwealth as an organization of federated groups, the theory of work, and much besides, could have found acceptance only in a land where industries are for the most part carried on in workshops, with the master workman (*maitre-ouvrier*) at the head of each, and a few journeymen employees besides. Many of the syndicalist theories, despite the denials of the Syndicalists themselves, are based on a conception of industry which is reminiscent of the guild system. I would quote, as a case in point, a recent essay of Edward Berth's, where (following Proudhon) he advocates as desirable for the organization of the working classes, a system in which the first stage should be the apprentice, the second the journeyman, and the third, and highest, the master.

In such an environment we should expect to find that the lower middle-class spirit is especially strong, and its influence threatens to crush the labour movement. The prevalence of this spirit, and the special character of the history of the country, are together responsible for the dislike of purely political action, more especially as the

proletarian movement, embodied in the trade-unions, is beginning to decline. This fact must be borne in mind if we are to account for the rise of Syndicalism at so late a stage in the Social Movement. It is only the reaction against this decline of the trade-unions in Romance lands. An English or German labourer finds it difficult to understand this anti-political policy (the English labourer would always have done so, the German only for the last ten years or so) because both are well organized in trade-unions. In Romance lands that is not the case. "The party," says Enrico Leone, "appeared on the scene of combat; it had a certain measure of success, but the success of its democratic policy did not keep pace with the development in class contrasts. Accordingly, it was a matter of supreme importance to devote special attention to the trade-union movement and to encourage it." Failing a strong trade-union movement in those countries, the democratic party seized upon the Social Movement and filled it with the spirit of the lower middle-class, so that Socialism really became only a democratic movement and the Socialist party a democratic party, and the specifically proletarian character of both was being gradually lost. This was most clearly seen when Millerandism appeared, and it was that, indeed, which gave the strongest impetus to the syndicalist reaction in France.

Another point must not be overlooked. Politics is in Romance countries largely in the hands of that class known as "Intellectuals" and of the lower middle-class. It is feared, perhaps with some justice, that neither of these classes would further the interests of the proletariat. An Englishman or a German or an American would hardly understand Lagardelle when he describes the "Intellectuals" as having the chief interest in the maintenance of the State. "On the one side are the working classes, on the other the great mass of the educated who give the political parties their leaders and exploit the State. It is the policy of such men to increase their own influence and

enlarge the scope of government action." In other than Romance lands this state of things is not known.

It appears then that the new theory could arise only in France or Italy, where the conditions are such as to call it into being. With this statement I might conclude my account of the syndicalist system and its influence on the Social Movement. But I believe that a number of the underlying ideas of the new theory are worth closer inspection, and, in any case, I am inclined to think that certain portions of the syndicalist doctrines are bound to have important practical results.

And so I shall attempt to value some of these ideas at their true worth, and to consider their influence on the Social Movement.

III. ITS INFLUENCE

There is no doubt that the Syndicalists have stimulated thought. They have tried to stir the masses, and to prevent them from being wholly paralyzed. The policy of "revision" did the same, but the Syndicalists are succeeding to a greater degree because their criticism cuts more deeply. They have indeed no objection to being called the party of "revision," only they do lay stress on the fact that they are opposed to peaceful "revision," and advocate "revision" by revolutionary methods. It is in this light that we must regard them, as it is in this way that their influence makes itself felt. For it is always good for heretics to arise wherever a High Church party is dominant. But apart from this, it is not impossible that when the Syndicalists are a little more matured, they will present the world with a social theory wholly in accord with modern views, a theory having elements of permanence in it. For the present, however, their system is more or less a patchwork, containing excellent material in parts, but also much that is useless and, indeed, dangerous.

Let us try to separate these elements.

In the first place, I do not intend to quarrel with the apostles of the new gospel about their hopes and ideals. The purpose of this work is a different one. It is concerned only with a theoretic and historic consideration of social phenomena, and scientific arguments are of little use in the criticism of purely personal outlooks on life.

But one remark I must make in this connection. The Syndicalists are always laying stress on the fact that the Social Revolution will be fully realized only when the future order of society has been established on a perfectly new lines, when it is filled with a completely new spirit; they never advocate the adoption of any capitalist institution for fear of compromising their position. And yet their ideals are taken from the capitalist world of thought! Is it possible that they do not clearly realize that the ideal of Progress, by which mankind has been deceived for centuries, by which it has been led about in the wilderness, is a product of capitalist conditions? Do they not see that the conception of social growth is in spirit capitalistic? Else how are we to explain that such highly-strung people, hypersensitive to the brutalities of modern civilization, adopt as their own the miserable ideal, worthy only of cotton-spinners, of the greatest possible intensity of production? "We have adopted from Marx," says Sorel in one place, "the statement that the progress of production can never proceed too quickly, and we regard this dictum as one of the most precious possessions in the master's legacy." Most remarkable! Two generations ago, Marx was still excused for having expressed so stupid a view (I was myself guilty of expressing it only ten years ago). But to-day, let no one who cares one jot for his reputation carry about such parvenu ideals as these, more especially if he is anxious to lay the foundations of a new order of society. The idea that there can never be too much production is the offspring of capitalistic snobbery.

For a long time it did seem that Syndicalism was really about to make a new and valuable ideal the corner-stone

of its fabric—the new ideal of the producer. For it pictured the new commonwealth as composed only of people who were productive, each in his own way; it divided up these people according to the extent and the nature of their productivity, and assigned payments to each according to the results of his work. Such a scheme (leaving out for the present the consideration as to whether or no it can be carried out) has much in it that is excellent. But very soon all that was new and attractive and catching about it was discarded, for the idea of production in this scheme was conceived in the old-fashioned Marxian sense, which held that only the manual labourer was really productive. Such rushlights as these cannot fill the world with light!

But as I said above, these general remarks are made only by the way. We shall, however, dwell more at length on those points which may be profitably discussed.

Let me say at once that there is one thing that does the Syndicalists great credit. They have seen more deeply than any other socialist thinkers into the evils of our modern civilization. Where the early Marxists saw solutions to difficulties and sometimes, indeed, no difficulties at all, the Syndicalists see problems. Thus, they have indicated the weakness of democracy and the dangers of demagoguery; they have pointed out that the centralization of functions in the hands of the State is an evil tending to destroy the powers of mankind; they deplore the growing influence of bureaucracy in all departments of life; they lay special stress on the fact that our system of work, which is based on the principle of the division of labour, is unworthy of humanity and opposed to the best thought of the day. But more than that. They add that none of these evils (which are cardinal evils in our social system) will ever be swept away by the socialization of the means of production, that is to say, when production on a capitalist basis has been succeeded by one on a Socialist basis, as the early Marxists believed.

But their solutions to all these difficulties are unsatis-

factory. It is of little use to attempt to get rid of these evils by decreeing that a social order shall be established which does not contain them. It is of little use to say: We do not want centralization; we do not want a bureaucracy; we want to replace them by a self-governing group of workers, which requires no overseeing and no government from above. It is of little use to say: We no longer want the factory and its division of labour, which has so deadening an effect on the mind; we want to replace it by a system where the worker makes the entire article of his craft, exercising his mind and expressing his taste in the process. All this is Utopian to a degree. All the demands here stated take no account whatever of the conditions which lie at the bottom of our social and economic order. Moreover, those who suggest the remedies mentioned overlook the fact that all the evils of our civilization are necessarily the result of two great facts. The first is the enormous increase in population in all countries, and the second is our advance in technical knowledge. The masses stand in need of modern technical knowledge, and that, in its turn, requires for its development the destruction of the old system of industry, where every handicraftsman made the complete article of his trade, and its replacement by a system where the division of labour prevails, and the principle of the localization of industry, either in a factory or in a district, follows as a natural consequence.

In view of this fact, what is the value of the suggestion that salvation will be found in the self-government of each group of labourers? Of what use is such a suggestion in view of the wonderfully improved means of communication which tend more and more to link together the most distant parts of the globe? What self-governing group of workers would be able to direct and manage the railways of North America, or the canals of any one country, or the ironworks of Essen or Pittsburg, without having to submit to interference from without? It is just here that we are able to realize that the Syndicalists have

as little knowledge of the world of realities as the Anarchists.

It is the same, perhaps even to a greater degree, with their ideas as to the new organization of labour. Let us hear Edward Berth, who is a specialist on this particular question. He says in one place, "In order that the workers may become really free, it is necessary for the hierarchical division of labour to be abolished. What is wanted is that the collective power of the workers shall set the factory going, and the particular group of workers in any factory shall acquire the intellectual qualities necessary for production, and develop the whole process, just as the capitalist undertaker does now. Direction and execution of the work will be in the hands of the workers. That is the only solution. Without that, Socialism becomes but an imitation of bourgeois arrangements."

We quite agree, Monsieur Berth, that this should be so. But is your decree sufficient to bring it about? We should like to know how the emancipation of the labourers is to take place. How would it be achieved in, say, a modern railway system, or a smelting works, or a steam-roller factory, or a coal mine, or a great emporium in the heart of a modern city, or in fact in any huge industrial or commercial undertaking? Unless you can give us an answer, those of us who know something of the organization of industry will be unable to comprehend the meaning of your fine phrases, will be unable to understand such expressions as this of Enrico Leone: "Socialism does not want to take over the factory system; it wants to abolish it." We shall be forced to regard it all as mere verbiage.

The great mistake which the Syndicalists, like the Anarchists, make on this point is that they do not realize that the form of modern civilization is determined first, by the large population on the earth's surface, and secondly, by the advance of technical knowledge. If, however, they do realize this, their mistake is that they do not say quite plainly, "Two premises must be made if our

plans are to be carried out successfully: (1) "the population of the world must shrink to at least half its size, and (2) every coal and iron mine in existence must be closed."

Excellent also, as it seems to me, is the syndicalist criticism of the theory of social evolution held by early Socialists; that is to say, of the early socialist conception of the way in which the future commonwealth will grow out of the present capitalist state.

Especially good is what they have to say concerning the theory of political changes which culminates in the doctrine of the Dictatorship of the proletariat. The Syndicalists are never tired of repeating that you cannot bring about the new social order merely by passing laws. They hold up to ridicule (quite rightly in my opinion) "the superstitious belief in Parliamentary action . . . which ascribes to acts of Parliament the magic power of bringing about new social forces"—as Leone puts it; or in the words of Sorel: "The belief in the magic influence of departmental authority." Labroila is of the same opinion. "Parties may elect members of Parliament, but they cannot set one machine going, nor can they organize one business undertaking."

The true view is rather that the new order will not come about until its members possess creative and organizing ability. The thought, so thoroughly Marxian in spirit (blurred somewhat, it is true—as we have already seen—by that crazy notion, worthy only of a Blanqui,¹ of the Dictatorship of the proletariat), that the new order must slowly grow out of the old if it is to have an independent existence (what I have called the Theory of Socialization), has been developed by the Syndicalists in a very unsatisfactory fashion. They lay the chief stress on the fulfilment of the psychological and ethical conditions which alone make the new order possible. Again and again they point out how great is the necessity for the human beings

¹ Louis-Auguste Blanqui was a French Revolutionary who advocated measures of violence. In 1870 he attempted to establish a Republic in France.

who will compose the new order to possess the technical knowledge and the moral qualities, or at least the germs of both, which are required before a new system of production can be introduced. They assert that you cannot build a new social order on a development in the powers of production alone—that is to say, on improvements in processes and in machinery. "Syndicalism," says Leone, "builds up its whole future on the economic, psychological, ethical and political power which must develop in the proletariat." Or, as Sorel puts it: "The new school of thought differs from official Socialism in this, that it has acknowledged the necessity for moral improvement."

All this is very well, but I believe that the way in which the Syndicalists imagine that these psychological and ethical conditions will come about is hardly satisfactory. Here, too, they become Utopian.

The Syndicalists, it will be remembered, attach very great importance to two things: the growth of the spirit of self-sacrifice, and the educative influence of the trade-unions.

As to the first, all discussion is, of course, at an end if it is asserted that on the day when the new social order commences a mental or spiritual power, hitherto not existing, will enter the soul of man. Childish ideas of this kind were very frequent in the past. But no responsible Socialist will give expression to them to-day. The Syndicalists, too, or to be more exact, Sorel—for he has developed the theory of sudden enthusiasm, as we may call it—Sorel does not proceed in the clumsy way of the old-fashioned Utopists who called upon the spirit of self-sacrifice and unselfishness as a sort of *deus ex machina* to come and make their dreams a reality. He is at pains to prove that in the future all men will be filled with but one desire—to work as much as they possibly can without expecting payment in proportion to the results of their work. We may recall his comparison with the soldiers of the revolutionary army. But what a difference! Theirs was a peculiar case. They were faced by the foe whom

they supposed to be the only obstacle which stood between them and the realm of freedom, happiness and harmony, as embodied in the Revolution. Their one thought was that a last and determined effort would liberate them for ever from all their afflictions. The reward of victory would be great indeed. And so they put forth their very best efforts.

It is, of course, possible that the strikers in a general strike may be filled with a similar spirit, especially if they were to believe that the battle was the last, and that success meant continual peace. They might say to themselves: "Let us make one last supreme effort, that we may win, and on the day of victory march into the promised land flowing with milk and honey." Yes, but what of the morrow? What if the promised land is not in sight? What if the round of daily tasks begins anew, and it is necessary once more to perform the dull and disagreeable work at the loom and the furnace, or in the sewers? When the fighting spirit is no longer called for, seeing that there is no foe to conquer, what then? Indeed, what connection is there between the sudden burst of enthusiasm of a general strike and the spirit of self-sacrifice with which, as Sorel thinks, the ordinary everyday affairs will be carried on when the strike is over? I cannot see any.

Nor is Sorel's second analogy more convincing. He points to the heroic sacrifices made by Mahommedan warriors. But he forgets that they are actuated by the hope of eternal bliss, which is one of the dogmas of their faith, a hope so strong that it drives away the fear of death. But is such self-sacrifice conceivable on the part of the "enlightened" peoples of our modern states?

It is even less to the point when Sorel mentions inventors who made their inventions from the pure love of inventing, and not in the expectation of receiving material reward. Perhaps that is true of some few individuals who were idealists of the first order. But to imagine that it would be possible to raise the masses to the level of these few exceptional men is absurd. Sorel is quite wrong

when he asserts that the number of these unselfish inventors is daily increasing, and instances by way of proof that in the United States the whole body of workers have contributed no small share to the improvements in machinery and in technical processes. I made a study of this particular point when I was in America,¹ and I can say that there is no question here of ideal self-sacrifice for a cause. It is nothing more nor less than the business-spirit, just one of the phenomena of the capitalist system which has seized upon the workers. Their participation in the work of bringing about improvements is due to their expectation of payment. American employers have made extensive arrangements for inducing the workers to make their experiences useful to their respective firms. Every workman is encouraged to make suggestions for improving machinery, and those suggestions which appear to be promising are carried out. If they prove successful and actually introduce economies, the particular workman receives a share of the profits. Surely this is, in reality, the very opposite of what Sorel has in view.

It is no proof of the near approach of the era of self-sacrifice, from which the Syndicalists expect so much for their future commonwealth, that there is a very epidemic of inventions in these days, extending even to the working classes. If it proves anything, it proves only this, that human nature, in the low condition to which it has to-day sunk, develops its powers and capabilities only when it is attracted by the prospect of profit. It is because inventors are greedy of gain that we have a pandemonium of inventions such as no other age knew, for in no other age was it possible to turn inventions so quickly into gold.

It is certainly a fine characteristic of the Syndicalists that they appeal to the nobler side of human nature; that because they are idealists themselves, they want an idealistic humanity. Their delicate psychological perception is also proved by the fact that they fully realize how

¹ Sombart was one of the German scholars sent by the Prussian Government to lecture at the St. Louis Exhibition.

enormous would be the spiritual bankruptcy of mankind if it were entirely deprived of the two great ideals which have hitherto shed light and brightness on the lives of the masses, and filled them with what is noble and sublime—the ideals of God, and of patriotism. But it is surely a foolish expectation to imagine that (as Lagardelle expresses it) “all the noble feelings which patriotism calls forth, heroism and self-sacrifice and unflinching obedience—the qualities which form the eternal foundation of life—will not cease to exist, but on the contrary, will continue to grow in the soul of the workers who are filled with the revolutionary spirit.” The ideal which the Syndicalists have in view can be brought about only by a constant struggle, by revolution, and as soon as the proletariat is victorious there will be no further cause for continuing the struggle. What would become of the ideal then? It is different in the case of patriotism. So long as nations exist, there is always opposition and the possibility of a struggle; and though in times of peace national feeling may become feeble, yet the mere possibility is sufficient to keep it alive.

But we can go further in criticism of the Syndicalists. Suppose we admit that the new ideal of revolution will completely replace the old ideals which have lost their hold on the people, how would that help us in bringing about the organization of production on socialist lines—the system which the Syndicalists hope to construct on the new ideals? For Capitalism is not based on patriotism, the ideal which the Syndicalists want to replace by another; it is supported by the very real feeling of self-interest. So that even if patriotism were replaced by another, more potent ideal, Capitalism would still remain unaffected. Look at it how we will, we must surely admit that it is but an empty dream to contemplate the possibility of raising the masses of to-day to a high idealism. Only one force is powerful enough to take away selfishness from common everyday life, and that force is intense religious enthusiasm. All other ideals will remain

for ever too weak to tame the beast in man, even though their aim, unlike that of the Syndicalists, be not temporary. For all but deeply religious natures, the proverb common in the Caucasus will hold good: "Who shall work? You and I. Who shall eat? I and you."

The other central idea of the syndicalist system is not quite so much in the clouds as this notion of a sudden burst of enthusiasm, which Sorel has put forward. It looks upon the trade-unions as the school where the working classes will obtain the knowledge, and develop the qualities, to enable them one day to seize the direction of production out of the hands of the capitalist undertakers and carry it on themselves. Here at least they deal with the average man, and not with a phantastic creature who is in a continuous state of ecstasy from morn till night.

What are we to say to this idea? Are the trade-unions well fitted to be training schools for those who in the new commonwealth will form themselves into groups of producers? I believe that if we examine the theory closely we shall find that there is a fundamental error in the reasoning of the Syndicalists. They are greatly mistaken in assuming that the working-man, when he attends the meetings of his trade-union, hears anything about the processes of production, or learns anything that will enable him later to become a manager or director of a business concern. I do not see what Leone is referring to when he writes: "In the trade-unions the capacity and the technical ability for directing the process of production are being developed on a new basis." I should like to know what the dock labourers learn of the management of a trans-Atlantic steamship company, or what the furnace workers learn of the organization of a mine, or of the calculations which regulate the production of iron, or what the shop-assistants learn of the working of a vast emporium, or, indeed, what any member of a trade-union learns concerning any one step in the process of production.

The trade-unions are certainly schools of experience

for the masses, and without them a healthy development of our social conditions would be inconceivable. What their educative influence is I tried to show some years ago in a little book of mine,¹ where I describe it as follows :

“The important point is that the quality necessary for co-operative rule should be slowly developed in a process of self-education. To put it more strongly, it is to train the men who, as representatives of the masses, are destined to influence the fortunes of the commonwealth. I am not thinking only of the few leaders, but also of the innumerable units, arranged in a graded hierarchy, who will participate in the work of government. The education mentioned must always have a double aim ; first, to teach the art of controlling others ; and secondly, that more difficult art of controlling oneself—to teach how to command and how to obey. It is especially in the art of self-control that I look to the trade-unions for much. They will be able to develop this particular quality in the individual as a voluntary effort ; they will show him the enormous value of a discipline which is self-imposed. The obedience of the soldier, or of the worker in the capitalist system, is something forced upon him from without. But the only obedience that is really valuable is that which is voluntary, that which springs from within.

‘That man is useless every way
Who can’t command and can’t obey.’

“The trade-union organization will lessen the number of those whom Goethe here puts down as useless. The influence of the trade-unions calls forth the virtue of voluntary obedience in more and more people. For the masses, whether noble or simple, rich or poor, it is the one political virtue which does them credit.

“But not only this. The trade-unions also develop in their leaders those organizing powers which the democracy of the future will need in large measure. Above all, the

¹ *Dennoch!* which was published in 1900, and deals with some aspects of the theory and history of the trade-union movement. The quotation in the text is from pp. 90, 91.

trade-unions give political understanding to both leaders and followers. I mean that they teach them that political and economic life is extremely complicated, and they show the most that can be achieved by political means—in a word, they point out what is practicable. This, after all, is the base on which the whole art of government rests: to know exactly what can be made out of the existing human material.

“That the trade-unions have still much to do in this direction will be denied only by those who are not acquainted with the facts, or by demagogues. To free the working classes from the influence of those shallow and ignorant talkers who set the tone in the Press and at public and private meetings—lazy fellows they are, who are good for nothing except to repeat parrot-like a few phrases from the party literature which they have got by rote, but which they by no means understand; ranters with loud voices, who are useless for any work but that of agitation—to free the working classes from the influence of men like these, is to my mind the great work for which the trade-unions are best fitted.”

But all this has nothing to do with the conception of the Syndicalists, that the worker is trained in his trade-union to become an independent producer, an organizer of industry and a manipulator in the world-market.

It is a fatal error to draw a parallel—as Sorel constantly does—between the slow growth of capitalist undertaking out of the feudal and guild system, and the development of trade-unions. The former were the lines on which economic life was slowly organized; the latter, however, have nothing to do with the process of production. If we want a parallel of this kind, we may find it solely and only in this: that just as Capitalism grew gradually out of the economic conditions of medieval society, so State and municipal undertakings (of which the Syndicalists will not hear a word) and co-operative stores are growing up in modern society. Here, indeed, there are the first, faint beginnings of means of production on new lines, and it is

here, and not in trade-unions, that we may see practical schools of Socialism. I regard it as one of the most serious defects of syndicalist teaching, that it entirely neglects the co-operative movement, and more especially co-operating shop-keeping. This is a pity, for it is just on questions like this that its outlook appears to be so promising. It would be a wise thing if the Syndicalists paid special attention to these phenomena, and, like Mr. and Mrs. Webb, set their hopes on an organic connection between the trade-unions and the co-operative societies.

When this criticism of the theory of trade-unions (as this portion of the syndicalist system may be called) the whole doctrine of the general strike is undermined.

In considering the effectiveness of this weapon in the class war, there is no need to ask whether the general strike is practicable, to ask whether the struggle of a united proletariat of any country against the powers that be, and supported by the majority of the citizens, would, at any time in the near future, end successfully. Let us assume this for the sake of simplicity; let us suppose that after three days all the means of production hitherto in capitalist hands have been seized by the proletariat. Would that, we ask, mean anything; would it lead to any lasting result? In other words, can we think of Socialism being realized in this way?

The conception is not impossible, but it demands one of two conditions. In the first place, we may adopt the position of the rationalist Socialists who postulated a "natural" state of society, ordained by God Almighty, with a harmony of its own, and only requiring to be discovered in order to be adopted. If we take up this position, the general strike may be regarded as the means of sweeping away the last remaining obstacles on the road to the promised land, more especially the class system and private enterprise. But Syndicalism refuses to take this point of view; it will have nothing to do with rationalistic (*i. e.* Utopian) Socialism. It wants above all, in the words of Leone, "to base itself on a realistic conception of

social life;” or as Sorel puts it, “it is filled with an insatiable desire for seeing things as they are.” This alternative, therefore, is out of the question.

There is then the other, which is the result of a realistic view of things, and says that when the great day arrives man and his environment must be already fitted to carry on production on new lines. But this, as we have seen, can never come to pass so long as it is believed that all that is necessary to bring out the qualities requisite to make the working classes producers, is to train them in trade-union organizations.

We thus see that even if the proletariat were victorious, the gain would not be much, seeing that it would not know what use to make of the victory. It is clear, therefore, that the idea of a general strike is hardly in keeping with a “realistic conception of social life.”

Obviously there are yet many gaps in the syndicalist fabric, the foundations are not always well and truly laid, there are rotten beams in the structure, and the walls show signs of crumbling.

What I mean is that although many excellent theories are expressed in Syndicalism, it is not yet by any means *the* social theory of our age. Before it can attain to such a position, many of the problems it has considered must be thought out anew, and in a much more effective fashion. Above all, it must cut itself adrift from the Marxian system. The Syndicalists to-day pride themselves on the fact that they are only seeking to present to the world the pure unadulterated doctrines of Marx. This certainly does them credit, and was the right course to pursue for tactical reasons. But it is hampering the development of their own ideas. As a matter of fact, the syndicalist ideas are wrecked on the Marxian scheme. It is not good to put new wine into old bottles, and it is not possible to formulate an effective social theory for the twentieth century by taking over from an older system the theories of value, of productivity, of the State, of class formation and class war, of revolution, and much besides.

What is wanted to-day is to create new values, to fill the proletarian world of ideas with new contents, and side by side with this, to promulgate an entirely new conception of the social world. I admit that the Syndicalists have made a good start in many directions; I should specially like to mention the researches of Leone on the part played in history by force and violence.^e But there is yet very much to be done. Let us hope that the Syndicalists will prove themselves true "revolutionary revisionists"; let us hope that they will not rest until they have destroyed the old doctrines and created new ones in their stead.

In this present chapter I have already taken the reader from the world of ideas into the world of actuality. I have gone from the consideration of Socialism to a review of the Social Movement. It is time, therefore, to look at this more closely, to see how it originated, how it developed and in what direction it is growing. We shall do so in the second part which follows.

PART TWO

THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

CHAPTER I

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

ON the very first page of this book we defined the Social Movement as "the conception of all the attempts at emancipation on the part of the proletariat as a social class." I should like now to limit this definition somewhat, and to add, "in so far as these attempts at emancipation are characterized by the proletarian spirit." I do so in order to separate the account of the modern Social Movement *par excellence* from that of similar movements which, though they paved the way for the former, were not themselves part of it. They might be classed as the early history of the Social Movement, and it is with this that we shall be occupied in the present chapter.

The early history of the movement, which extends to about the middle of the nineteenth century, shows a remarkable similarity in all lands with a capitalist economic system, and is everywhere characterized by the same features. Wherever the movement of the masses had a clear aim in view, it was not yet a movement of the proletariat; and where it was a movement of the proletariat, it had not yet a clear aim in view. That is to say, in those movements of which the proletariat is but a part, the aims are enunciated by other and non-proletarian elements, such as the middle-class groups; and where the proletariat rises independently, it shows all the immaturity of a social class which is just becoming conscious of itself; it has certain instinctive desires, but as yet no definite and well-defined demands.

The historical events in which the proletariat played a part, but which were not yet proletarian movements, were the well-known revolutions which occurred in the

years 1789, 1793, 1830, 1832 and 1848. At bottom all these movements were middle-class movements, and their aim was to give political rights to the middle classes. If we encounter proletarian elements in the ranks of those who fought for the cause of the middle or lower middle classes, we may regard them as being in the same position as the archers who fought the battles of the medieval nobles. This fact has been quite overlooked by many notable historians, and hence we often hear Communism and Socialism mentioned in connection with all the revolutions since 1789. As this is a somewhat important point, it will be of advantage to show, quite briefly, that such a connection is erroneous. We shall, therefore, glance at each separate revolution mentioned, because each of them has a special character of its own.

Even the most short-sighted observer must admit, on examining the Revolution of 1789, that it was a purely middle-class movement, or, to be quite precise, an upper middle-class movement. These upper middle classes were struggling for the recognition of their rights, and for their emancipation from the privileges which the ruling classes of society claimed; they were attempting to throw off the fetters by which a feudal power and an absolute monarchy held them bound. The demand of the movement was, indeed, for freedom and equality, but it was freedom and equality according to the conception of the upper middle classes. Look at the earliest social legislation of the new government in France, and you will see that it breathes anything but a friendly spirit to the people or to the workers. We see perfectly clearly at first sight that this legislation was not made by the masses for the masses, but that it was bourgeois in character from the first. The well-known *Loi Martiale* of the 20th of October 1789, a sort of Riot Act, expresses the contrast plainly enough when it speaks of the *bons citoyens* (good citizens) who must be defended from the attacks of the *gens mal intentionnés* (evilly-minded people) by more stringent police measures—"If the masses do not disperse after having

been ordered to do so, the armed force shall fire." The lower orders, down on the Piazza, were going to be forcibly taught that if the populace again seized the bread in bakers' shops without permission from above, means would be taken to prevent a dagger entering the breast of an honest master-baker.¹

It was the same with another important law of those years, which was also middle class in spirit. I refer to the Coalition Law of the 17th of June 1791. This inflicted a fine of five hundred livres and the loss of citizenship for a year on any one attempting to organize the workers in any calling for the purpose of safeguarding their "so-called" common interests, and it looked on every such attempt as an attack on freedom and the rights of man. "*Il n'est permis à personne,*" said Le Chapelier,² "*d'inspirer aux citoyens un intérêt intermédiaire, de les séparer de la chose publique par un intérêt de corporation.*" (No one shall be allowed to give citizens an interest in anything outside the State, or to take away their attention from the general cause by putting before them the interests of a special body.) It is true that the law applied equally to masters and men, but it is generally known what equality of this kind means.

Upon this followed the Constitution of the 3rd of November 1791, which established the new social order. By its enfranchisement of those only who paid direct taxes, it introduced the distinction between a wealthy ruling class and a dependent class composed of the poor. Henceforth there were first and second class citizens.

The Revolution of 1789, then, was anything but a proletarian movement. This is not quite so clear in the case of that of 1793, which, indeed, professional historians like Sybel delight in terming communist. They look upon

¹ On 5th October 1789 there was a riot in the square in front of the Paris town-hall because there was a lack of bread. Many bakers shops were broken into, and one master-baker, François by name, was murdered.

² Le Chapelier was a member of the first committee appointed to draft the Constitution.

the men of the Mountain party as the forerunners of the Social Democrats, and only recently one of this school asserted that the leaders of this revolution were, in fact, Social Democrats. I cannot accept this statement. But let us see!

I maintain that the Revolution of 1793 was not a proletarian movement. I admit that in it, as in all the French revolutions, there is a democratic under-current, and no doubt it is this which has led so many people astray. The same democratic under-current shows itself already at the Election to the States-General of 1789, and by 1793 it had gathered great force.

If we examine the *Cahiers*¹ of 1789 with their *Doléances*, those documents wherein the electors specified their wishes to their representatives, more especially those from Paris and Lyons, we shall find in them a tone which is scarcely in harmony with the official tone of smug satisfaction entertained by the gentlemen who frequented ballrooms. There is constant reference to the misery of the time—the winter of 1788-89 had been hard and bitter—and the conviction is expressed that a liberal constitution will not mend matters. "The voice of Freedom has but a poor message to him who is starving." A demand is made for fixing the price of bread, for employment and for the abolition of Sundays and holy days as days of rest. We all know how this tone reappeared in the speeches and writings of Marat. *L'ami du peuple* (Marat's paper) thundered against the "Aristocrats," and expressed its willingness to help forward the popular cause. People began to perceive that "Equality and Freedom" were of little use to the poor. Marat, indeed, went further; he deduced the doctrine that "Equal rights meant equal enjoyment, and it is only then that the idea of equality is fully developed." Then came fixed prices; then the *Maximum*. But, despite all this, the question may still be asked, was it a proletarian, socialist move-

¹ A good account of these *Cahiers des plaintes et doléances* may be found in the Cambridge Modern History, vol. viii, p. 134.

ment? Could it be such? Who were the leaders, and who the followers?

The democratic under-current in the Revolution of 1793 had its source, as is well known, in Lyons and in Paris. There were certainly proletarian elements to be found at Lyons among the silk workers. Statistics of the day (1788-89) are still in existence, and from these it may be seen that there were then in the Lyons silk industry 410 capitalist undertakers, 4,202 master-weavers and 1,796 journeymen, beside some 40,000 other workers of both sexes. We are forced to conclude that under these circumstances proletarian interests, or, at least, proletarian instincts, must have shown themselves. The seeds of such were certainly there, but the peculiar organization of the Lyons silk industry checked their development. For it always had, as it has still, a certain middle-class tendency, and that for two reasons. In the first place, the industry was so organized that the work was not done in large factories, but in small workshops under the direction of independent masters. These formed a kind of connecting link between the great capitalist undertakers and the labourers, and, because of their position, were not inclined to throw in their lot with the proletariat. That was one reason. The other was that the Lyons silk industry manufactured an article of luxury, and industries manufacturing luxuries were, from the nature of the case (certainly in olden times), anti-revolutionary. The men of the Mountain party did not require silk stockings. And so we find, as we should have expected, that when the first excitement was over, Lyons is on the side of La Vendée at the head of the counter revolution, and that, too, in the early seventeen-nineties.

The more anti-revolutionary Lyons became the more Paris, with its suburbs, came to the fore. It was from there that fresh bands constantly arrived—the hosts of the *sans-culottes*. Now, who were these? They certainly included many wage-earners in their ranks. But, thanks to the peculiar characteristics of Parisian industries, these

people were still, to a very great extent, small independent journeymen. In any case, they did not form the mass of the *sans-culottes*. By far the great majority was made up of the lower middle class of Paris; that is to say, of the small, independent masters who lived in and about the Faubourg St. Antoine and Du Temple, and of that element which the French call *la boutique*, small tradesmen, publicans, and so on—a by no means unimportant group. All these were joined by the loafers of the capital, who abounded even then; we should, perhaps, call them to-day the “submerged tenth.” Such were the followers of Danton, Robespierre and Marat. And the leaders themselves? What was the spirit that filled them? At bottom they belonged to the lower middle class. They were extreme radicals and individualists; their ideals were anything but proletarian or socialistic. Look at the political will and testament of St. Just and you will see what his ideas were of the new commonwealth. He desired to see all the land of France divided equally among the inhabitants, each to carry on his domestic and industrial economies in strict independence, producing himself all that he needs. The men of the Mountain gave but a political expression to the ideals of the great philosophers of the eighteenth century. But neither Voltaire, Diderot nor Rousseau knew anything of a proletariat in the modern sense, and, therefore, the idea of a proletarian movement could not have entered their heads. With all this the spirit of the constitution of 1793 is only in accord when, in its second article, it defines the rights of man as Equality, Liberty, Security and—Property.

To talk, therefore, as some of our professional historians do, of a communist movement at the time of the great French Revolution, is to show no deep understanding of history and a sad lack of the power of differentiation. The revolution of 1783, which is a case in point, proves how rash it is to talk of Social Democrats of the modern Social (*i. e.* proletarian) Movement wherever there is brawling and fighting.

The other social movements of the time I shall touch but briefly. There was, first, Babeuf's Rebellion in 1796. This certainly had some communist elements in its programme, but it is well known that it was completely out of touch with the masses, who were becoming tired of revolutions.

The July revolution in France in 1830, and the similar movement in Germany in 1848, were most certainly middle-class movements. In both cases the middle classes were at war with the feudal aristocracy, and in both cases they gladly allied themselves with the working classes. It has been said that the bourgeoisie used the proletariat as a sort of Jack-in-the-box with which to terrify their opponents; and when by its aid they had obtained what they wanted, they closed the box and imprisoned Jack once more. Facts would seem to support this statement. In 1830 the French manufacturers closed their factories, and sent their workmen to fight in the barricaded streets. Two years later, when these same workmen took it into their heads to commence a revolution without permission, it was these very manufacturers who, as members of the National Guard, shot them down in cold blood.

Not quite so apparent is the bourgeois character of the revolution in England in 1832, and the February revolution in France in 1848. The reason for this is that the governments against which both movements were directed were middle-class governments. Nevertheless, neither of these movements were proletarian in character; in both, one section of the bourgeoisie opposed another; the radical manufacturers struggled against the moneyed interest.

These, then, were the social movements at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, and the proletariat took part in all of them. But not one can be regarded as a specially proletarian movement in the modern sense.

It was not, however, to remain so always. The proletariat were soon found fighting for their own interests, though

it was a long time before the first inarticulate wishes became a rallying cry, the cry a common, general demand, and the general demand a party programme. The first proletarian movements, "the agitations of the unhappy, submerged masses," were, in the words of Carlyle, "like those of Enceladus, who produced earthquakes as he shook from side to side in his pain." They were instinctive movements clutching at what might give them a hold, and throwing themselves with blind fury against what they regarded as obstacles in their way. Robbery and plunder seemed justifiable to the men who took part in those movements, for their end was to crush the foe by seizing his possessions. Thus, in England, towards the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, there were numberless instances of the destruction and plundering of factories. In 1812 a law was passed making this a capital offence, and the necessity for such a law proves only that the crime must have been very widespread.

The rising of the weavers in Germany in the eighteenth-forties, so wonderfully depicted by Gerhart Hauptmann in his play, belongs to the category of proletarian movements. The war against factories and machines must have been pretty widespread in Germany too. "Among many of you," said a machine manufacturer in Chemnitz, addressing the German working classes in 1848, "among many of you there exists, together with other things, a most dangerous prejudice. You imagine that work will become more plentiful if one machine or another be set aside. The printers, for example, would like Perrot's press and the rolling machines to be discarded, or, at any rate, to be used to a limited extent, so that the printers in any given town might all be employed. The weavers oppose the introduction of the mechanical weaving-jenny by all means in their power. The wool-combers demand that the combing machines shall be given up. In Mayence, indeed, the manual labourers have succeeded in forcing the owners of steam engines to cease work."

It was the same in other countries. There was the

burning of factories in Uster, in Switzerland, in 1832; there was the rising of silk weavers at Lyons in 1831. This last is distinguished from similar risings by the fact that it took as its motto what may be regarded as the motto of all proletarian movements: *Vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combattant* (To live by working or to die fighting). It is the first faint battle-cry of the proletariat that we hear; and both negatively and positively it expresses a dogma of socialist ethics. No one shall live who does not work—that is the negative side. But he who does work shall be enabled to live—that is the positive side. The activities of the first movements, therefore, were directed against the symbols that represented the opposing forces—factories and machines, and the homes of the masters. The two former were wrecked because they were looked upon as mighty competitors with manual labour; the latter, because they appeared as the centres from which the evil influences radiated.

A step further was taken in social development when, instead of attacking the outward tangible expressions of the capitalist economic system, the Social Movement began to oppose the legal principles on which that system rested. While demanding the abolition of free competition in production, and of free wages contract, it sought to have the pre-capitalist organization of industry, that is, the Guild system, restored. Thus the proletariat in England at that time struggled hard for the re-introduction of the Elizabethan Statute of Artificers of 1563, which had laid it down, among other things, that no master shall have more than one apprentice for every three journeymen he employed; that the period of apprenticeship should be for seven years, and that wages should be fixed by the justices of the peace.

The same was the case in Germany, even in 1848. We have already attempted to show that the revolution of that year was really a middle-class revolution. But side by side with it a Labour movement appeared which expressed itself in numerous outbreaks. Its demands were

expressed in the "Resolutions of the Labour Congress," held at Berlin in 1848 from the 23rd of August to the 3rd of September. Of these several were purely proletarian; for example, the demand for the introduction of a ten hours' working day, and the abolition of child labour. In addition to this we find a proposal for the establishment of a credit institution for workers which shall "grant loans at interest, provided sufficient guarantees be forthcoming, and while every one may participate in its benefits, working men shall have a prior claim over others." Furthermore, the Resolutions demanded extended political rights for the poorer classes and the erection of undenominational schools. But in all that had reference to economic activity, the demands were for the re-establishment of conditions which had prevailed in the past. Thus, in their twelfth paragraph they resolved that: "No one shall carry on, or cause to be carried on, any business which requires technical skill unless he has served his apprenticeship to it." In paragraph thirteen they say: "All work in prisons shall cease"; in paragraph fifteen: "Peddling in commodities made by manual labour shall not be allowed"; in paragraph twenty-five: "The masters' societies shall see to it that competition among masters ceases, or, at any rate, is diminished"; in paragraph thirty: "No master shall take an apprentice unless he is certain of training him. For the purpose of the future examination of apprentices a committee of masters and men shall be elected. The examination shall be practical and theoretical. The period of apprenticeship shall not as a rule extend over more than three years." In paragraph thirty-one we read: "The local committee shall prevent one and the same master from taking too many apprentices." The journeymen were always glad to become masters themselves, as was shown in the case of the silk weavers of Crefeld. These managed (by the agreement of 27th March, 1848) to obtain possession of all the weaving shuttles, and the legal recognition of themselves as masters. They at once formed themselves

into a craft. "At once," says Alphons Thun, to whom we are indebted for these particulars, "the journeymen showed all the characteristics of masters. Nor, in all its narrowness, was craft regulation wanting. It was laid down that no master should work more than four shuttles, or employ girls (with the exception of the daughters of deceased masters) in weaving."

In this early period also can be traced the first attempts of the proletariat, though as yet weak and uncertain, to form those organizations which were destined to play an important part in their struggle for emancipation. The earliest trade-unions, though mostly unsuccessful, appear at this time.

What I have in my mind are those "general Unions of Workers" which were to include the whole proletariat of each country. There was the "Grand National Union," which was started in England under the influence of Robert Owen; there was the *Gewerkschaftsbund*, founded by Schweitzer in Germany a generation later. One thing they had in common: they tried to reach the stars, and so fell in consequence. They made the mistake of giving expression to the trade-union idea in the manner of bourgeois secret societies, such as the Freemasons. Although on paper their membership was enormous, after a few years they had achieved nothing, and had filled their followers with despair. It was the same with the numerous attempts to organize working men into co-operative societies, in order that they might be enabled to participate in economic activity independently of the capitalist undertakers. Organizations of this kind were the Co-operative Production Societies. They were attempts to fill capitalist undertakings with the proletarian spirit; to bring about Socialism by the aid of capitalist principles. They were bound to fail, and they did. The whole tendency was a bubble which soon burst.

The first movement of this period which approaches nearest to the modern proletarian movement is that of the Chartists in England between 1837 and 1848. It is the

last in the early history of the Social Movement, but though it has been called the first, really socialist and proletarian movement, it has very much in common with the others we have mentioned. It differs from them in one important point, however: they were all sudden ebullitions of the feelings of the masses, but the Chartist movement was properly organized and was carried on systematically for a decade. Proletarian it certainly was, and may, if we will, be regarded as the first organized proletarian movement on a large scale: proletarian, because the great masses of the Chartists were wage-earners, proletarian because its demands arose out of the necessities of the proletariat, and one of its foremost aims was to improve the material conditions of the oppressed factory workers. Thus, a reasonable working day was demanded; and, in the words of Stephens, "The question with which we are here occupied is a bread and butter question!" The movement was proletarian also in that the opposition between Labour and Capital often came clearly to the surface. The "government" and the "ruling" class were identified with the capitalist class. This feeling found its expression in the intense hatred of the masses for the great capitalist undertakers. "Down with the wretches who suck your children's blood, take advantage of the misery of your wives, and live on what you have made in the sweat of your brow!" As we read these words of O'Connor, we believe we are listening to a speech at a meeting of the proletariat to-day. Furthermore, it was wholly in the proletarian spirit that the rights of Labour were emphasized. The right of the labourer to have all the product of his labour was one of the demands of the rising—the right to the "surplus value" which unjustly goes into the pockets of the capitalist undertakers. The proletarian spirit of the Chartist movement was further shown by the increasing disregard of the middle-class demands, such as, for example, the abolition of duties on corn. It is most interesting, in fact, to see how all along the line the Chartists care less and less for the

demands of the bourgeoisie, who, notwithstanding that they had participated in the early stages of the movement, were abandoned in the end. Proletarian, too, was the form the struggle took; the idea of a general strike as a weapon in the conflict could have arisen only in a purely proletarian movement. In short, there is sufficient justification for regarding the Chartist movement as such.

And yet I place it in the early history of the Social Movement. For Chartism had not the clear and well-defined programme of a proletarian Social Movement; it had not consciously set itself an aim to be realized. The Charter, which was the programme of the movement, far from containing purely socialist demands, was nothing more than an attempt at parliamentary reform. It was a sort of makeshift programme adopted for lack of a better, and taken over in entirety from the radical middle-class democracy. What were the demands? "Manhood suffrage, vote by ballot, annual parliaments, payment of members relieved from the property qualification and equal electoral districts."

Clearly, notwithstanding its proletarian kernel, notwithstanding the proletarian spirit which inspired it, the Chartist movement must be separated from the later proletarian movements by the character of its programme. I lay special stress on this point, because very often people like Brentano,¹ who have so good a knowledge of English history, have spoken of the Chartists as though they were an exact parallel to the German Social Democratic party of to-day. There may be, it is true, some similarity in the outward form, seeing that the latter strives, as the former did, to obtain political power. But we must judge and classify social movements by their inner spirit, and the inner spirit of the Chartists is a very different one to that of the German Social Democrats of to-day.

¹ L. J. Brentano (*b.* 1844), Professor of Economics at the University of Munich, spent some time in Dublin in his student days, and is now one of the authorities on English economic history.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL PECULIARITIES

PREFATORY

THE early history of the Social Movement had, as we have seen, many characteristics in common in the different lands with a capitalist system of industry. There is nothing remarkable in that, seeing that the causes which led to the Social Movement were everywhere the same. Everywhere we observed how Capitalism grew in strength until, with a mighty force, it was able to sweep away the old-established economy, and crush the masses under foot. The masses then began to reflect on the conditions of their existence, and, perhaps instinctively, thoughts of opposition arose in their minds. That was the first stage in the growth of the movement. The last stage, as we shall see, also tended to uniformity in all lands. Here, too, the same effect was due to the same cause. The capitalistic spirit had penetrated into every pore of the body politic, and everywhere the same results were the consequence.

But between these stages there was an intermediate period during which the Social Movement developed differently in different countries. It was the period in which each nation attempted to solve the problem before it in its own way, according to its special peculiarities. The question was, either to incorporate or to throw off Capitalism, and differences in temperament, in history, and in political and economic conditions were responsible for differences in the solution. But though at first it had its own peculiarities in each country, the Social Movement eventually tended more and more to sameness. The tributaries joined each other at different points to form the main stream of the mighty river.

The orderly arrangement of our subject makes it necessary to examine the peculiar characteristics of the Social Movement in each country during this stage of its history, and to combine them into national types. We shall find that there were three such, each distinct from the other—the English, the French and the German types.

The first had no political or socialist aims: it was distinguished by the formation of trade-unions and co-operative societies; in the second, the old revolutionary spirit sought to realize itself anew; and the last type was that of a Labour movement in the spirit of Marx, adopting legal, parliamentary and political methods. Let us look more closely at each.

I. THE ENGLISH TYPE

Here is the broad outline of the course of the Social Movement in England until the middle of the eighteenth-eighties. First of all, there were intermittent attempts to shake the foundations of the capitalist economic organization. These were given up in favour of a well-planned scheme of attack on the bulwarks of society, and were expressed in the great Chartist movement of the thirties and forties when, as Mrs. Webb put it, the English working classes passed through their "heroic period." But somehow the revolutionary feelings soon died out. The proletariat had no longer the desire for political strife, and had lost its faith in a state of things which might be an improvement on that offered by the capitalist system. After 1850 the English working classes adopted the policy of quietly making the most of every opportunity. To the great delight of all social reformers, the working classes in England discarded all socialist chimeras. Nor did they entertain the idea of forming an independent political party. Continuing to support the Whigs or the Tories, they realized that the capitalist organization had to be reckoned with, and so strove to improve their posi-

tion within the framework of Capitalism. They were eminently successful in this, for the 'standard' of comfort among the working classes was raised, and there was a good deal of legislation for their protection. The old irreconcilable opposition between Capital and Labour began to vanish in the face of a mutual recognition by both sides of each other's rights and demands. The Social Movement appeared to have taken the road towards social peace.

We must here note a point of the utmost importance. It was to the spirit of resignation on the part of the English working classes that we owe the creation and perfection of two institutions which are to-day the backbone of every Labour movement, and without which, indeed, it would be difficult to think of a Social Movement: the trade-union and the co-operative society. I have attempted to give a full account of the trade-union movement elsewhere;¹ here I shall lay stress on those points only which show most clearly what England contributed to the Social Movement as a whole. It will be seen that the principles of all modern trade-union policy were first enunciated by English workers, and that to them we are indebted for the trade-union movement of to-day.

The first union which was filled with the modern spirit was that of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, founded in 1851. This was a "Trade" union in the best sense of the word—the union of all the workers belonging to one trade. It showed that the fantastic idea of a trades-union (the organization of all the workers in any country or any district into one union) was dead and gone. The new trade-union also laid down a scheme for the incorporation of all workers in the trade all over the country. Branches were to be formed in every district, each independent in itself, and the union was to be the federation of the branches. The union was partly of the nature of a friendly society and partly an institution for the regulation of strikes, which were looked upon as the

¹ In his *Dennoch!*, cp. p. 124.

special weapon of the trade-unions. Subscriptions were levied on the members, and the fund so accumulated was used to support members in time of sickness, or to help those dependent on them in case of death, and in time of strikes the members looked to this fund for support.

The English workers also originated the modern form of labour contract, which has been called the method of Collective Bargaining. After trying various means of fixing the conditions of labour, it was eventually found most practical to arrange the terms for fixed periods in a friendly way between the organizations of masters and men respectively. One must have a thorough knowledge of the vicissitudes in the history of the English trade-unions if he would appreciate to the full the importance of the arrangement. That which to-day seems so easy and natural was a laborious business, and more than once success was delayed by innumerable attacks.

Moreover, it was due to the English workers that the trade-unions were recognized and respected by the State, and that their numbers and their influence increased. In 1874, when the movement in other countries was still in its childhood, the Sheffield Congress was attended by delegates representing no less than a million thoroughly organized wage-earners.

Side by side with the trade-unions, the co-operative movement was developed in England, and it has become the model for similar movements in other countries. That dark December evening in the year 1844 when the Auld Wayver's Shop was opened in Toad Street, Rochdale, was a red-letter day in social history. "Amid the jeers of the street-arabs of Rochdale, the scornful attitude of a few inquisitive shopkeepers and the careless remarks of the passers-by, the shutters of the store, situated in a back street, were removed, and tiny quantities of butter, sugar, flour and oatmeal were exposed to the view." The shop was open only on Saturday and Monday evenings; and one of the members of the society (all of whom belonged to the proletariat) acted as salesman, another as book-

keeper, a third as cashier, and a fourth as treasurer. The turnover amounted to £2 weekly, and the whole capital was no more than £28. Half of the original members were followers of Robert Owen; the other half were Chartists. Such was the end of the two movements, but it was at the same time the beginning of the great co-operative movement, and more especially of the co-operative stores, in which to-day some two million people participate, which has a capital of over twenty-five million pounds, and which supplies consumers with commodities, the total value of which is about fifty million pounds sterling.

Here, too, it must be put down to the credit of the English people that they created a new form of co-operation which contained the seeds of life. The movement was begun in order to supply the wants of a small circle of families by buying at wholesale prices and selling at a price as near as possible to the market rate. But there was not the slightest intention to make a profit, and so at the end of the year the surplus over cost price was divided out among the consumers in proportion to their purchases. These were the distinguishing features of the new organization, which was thus enabled to avoid shipwreck on the rocks of Capitalism. Moreover, there was no danger of an insufficient demand—a danger fatal to all productive co-operative societies. The system so developed gave scope for extension and growth; the number of those who might participate was unlimited, and the membership was maintained because of the benefits it conferred. On a simple organization of this kind it was possible to establish organizations wider in extent, and so the great co-operative movement grew until it became an influential economic factor, powerful enough to deal Capitalism a fatal blow. As soon as it undertook the direct supply of commodities there was no further need for the work of the capitalist undertakers. The result was the same, whether it bought commodities in large quantities from the manufacturers on the spot and dis-

tributed them by its own means of transport, or manufactured the commodities itself. The English societies adopted both means; they established large societies for wholesale purchases, and built factories for supplying their own needs. The former have an annual turnover of some twenty-five million pounds; in the latter, goods to the value of ten millions are manufactured every year.

The working classes of other lands may to-day have developed the co-operative movement to even greater possibilities of usefulness (we need but instance Belgium); it may be that in other lands the movement is more widespread. But it was founded in England, and it is to the everlasting glory of Englishmen that they originated co-operation among wage-earners.

Now, how are we to account for the special characteristics of the Social Movement in England? How account, above all, for the absence of the direct socialist note, seeing that the proletariat of no other country was so near to a revolutionary Socialist movement as that of the English proletariat in the Chartist movement?

I will first give the common explanation, although I cannot myself regard it as satisfactory.

This explanation usually begins by pointing out that the proletariat behaved shockingly in England during the first few decades of the nineteenth century, until in the Chartist movement it became intolerable; that it was embittered by a cheap materialism, and fought wildly for what it was pleased to call its rights. Then, about the middle of the century, the movement suddenly becoming respectable, accepted the prevailing economic order, and was on the best of terms with the capitalist undertakers, who had likewise improved in character. And why did all this come about? Because a new spirit filled mankind; there was a new point of view; a change from that of the individualist political economists and utilitarians to a social conception of society and of the duties which each man owed to his neighbour. The new spirit was preached by Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) and the Christian Socialists,

Maurice, Kingsley, Ludlow and the rest. The teaching of Carlyle may be summarized in this way. All the troubles which have afflicted Europe—the French Revolution, the Chartist movement—are due to the fact that the Spirit of Evil was in the ascendant—Mammon-worship and Selfishness, and therefore neglect of Duty. This Spirit must be replaced. Instead of Scepticism, Faith must fill men's hearts; instead of the cult of Mammon, we must have Idealism; instead of Selfishness, Self-sacrifice; instead of Individualism, the Social Spirit! No longer, as the utilitarian philosophy with its stress on happiness teaches, must the individual be the centre of the universe. Men must be moved by social ends, by objective values—in a word, by ideals. If such were the case, the relation between Capital and Labour would be ennobled; the employer would become more humane, he would become a true master; the worker would become more obedient, he would become a faithful servant. The so-called Christian Socialists had the same message, only they tried to deduce it from the gospel truths of Christianity.

And this spirit, it was said, brought about social peace. Hatred and Distrust vanished, and their place was filled by Love and Confidence. The social question was solved; Capitalism was saved; Socialism was cast aside like an old garment.

We shall see later that this prophecy of a social peace did not quite hit the mark, and that Socialism prevails in England to-day just as much as in other lands. But more of this in due course. Our purpose here is to find a satisfactory explanation for the trend of things in England until the early eighteen-eighties, during a period when the working-class movement in England was not revolutionary and not socialistic. The explanation, I have mentioned, does not satisfy me in the least. It is too "ideal," too unreal. I must confess that I can find little of that social spirit which is said to have worked such wonders. On the contrary, any one may see that the institutions which specially characterize the English proletariat during this

period—trade-unions, and co-operation—are based on a healthy self-interest. Indeed, it is doubtful whether there ever were more egotistical organizations than the trade-unions. And when I read the jeremiads of the Christian Socialists, complaining that they have been utterly unsuccessful in their aims, I can quite understand them; my own observations lend support to their conviction. But even if we allow the social spirit a certain influence, an influence manifesting itself in the legislation to protect workers of all kinds, and in the recognition of trade-unions, are we to believe that it was strong enough to move mountains? Should we not rather suppose that political and economic progress (in both of which self-interest is very strong) is accountable for much of what is put down to the social spirit; that, at any rate, they produced the conditions where that spirit might be effective?

I believe that it is not very difficult to give a realistic explanation of the peculiar development of the Social Movement in England in the period from 1850 to 1880.

To begin with, we must examine the character of the English people if we wish to explain the behaviour of the English working classes. It is generally accepted that Englishmen are as a rule, above all things, supremely calm and dispassionate. They lack what may be called the fire of the soul. In proof of which we need only think of their philosophy and their literature. (It was because Lord Byron was bored to death by his country that he fled from it.) But they also lack the power of speculation and of systematizing; they are so very practical; and for this reason they have conquered the world. That, too, will account for the preference of the English working classes for a policy of making the most of every opportunity as it came along. They set themselves aims which could be realized, and insisted on them with bulldog pertinacity. It was a "practical" policy, a policy of "inconsistent opportunism," as the Webbs, the philosophers of Collective Bargaining, have called the policy of the English trade-unions. But while the national char-

acter is no small factor in the explanation we are seeking, it is not the only factor. After all, let us not forget that the same people, who after 1850 behaved so respectably, were very revolutionary before.

To get a complete explanation, therefore, we shall have to take account of the special circumstances of the time, more especially the economic and political conditions prevailing in England in the thirty years after 1850.

There is no doubt that to the exceptional industrial position of England during the period was due its peculiar social development. The country enjoyed a period of unique prosperity. Thus, there were in 1842 only 1,857 miles of railway in England; in 1883 the figure had grown to 18,668 miles. In the first-named year, the shipping in all British harbours totalled but 935,000 tons; in 1883 it was 65,000,000 tons. Exports and imports in 1842 amounted in value to about 103,000,000 pounds; it was 732,000,000 pounds in 1883. All this means that England occupied an exceptional position, seeing that other countries did not develop in anything approaching the same ratio. It means that England had opportunities of enlarging its markets, and was so placed as not to be so affected by crises to the same extent as other lands.

What influence did all this have on the position of the wage-earners? Clearly they enjoyed many advantages. There was an increasing demand for labour, and therefore a decrease in unemployment; employers' profits were high, and they were able and willing to pay high wages—to let the worker (as it were) participate in the showers of material blessing.

The party system in English politics was responsible for much in the same direction as the economic factors we have mentioned. Whigs and Tories succeeded each other in the government of the country in a political game of see-saw. Both were prepared to submit to the demands of the time, if by so doing they might come into power. Both were on the look-out for opportunities which might assist them to that end; and now one, and now the other.

was first in the race. The working classes profited by this struggle for power, for they were offered much by each party to tempt them to throw in their weight on the one side or the other. It requires no great insight to perceive that legislation to protect the workers was favoured by the Tories, only that they might play it off against the Liberal factory-owners. Or, if we impute nobler motives to the ruling party, the Tories did not much mind framing laws in favour of the industrial proletariat so long as they did not apply to the agricultural proletariat as well. Later on, especially when the franchise was extended, it became the policy of the Whigs to get into power, or to maintain themselves when there, with the help of the working classes. That meant, of course, that willy-nilly they had to adopt a policy favourable to the wage-earning class, even though they themselves, as capitalist undertakers, were against it.

But, as a matter of fact, owing to the exceptionally good economic conditions in England, it was to the interest of whatever party were in power, if not to help forward, at any rate not to hinder, the movement of the working classes to improve their material position in the framework of the existing economic organization.

And so we find that the trade-unions received legal recognition; the masters expressed their willingness to make terms with the representatives of the men; they served on arbitration boards and conciliation committees. Now, are we to suppose that they did all this because a love for the working classes suddenly filled their breasts? Are we to suppose that it was because Carlyle had advised them to do so? Or was it not rather entirely because of selfish motives? Because the conservative, somewhat aristocratic trade-unions formed a dam against all revolutions, much more effective than any number of police regulations? Because conciliation was a useful means of avoiding strikes, and so of avoiding a standstill in production? To have to cease work was an eventuality which the capitalist undertakers, in a time of constantly satis-

factory conditions, dreaded most of all. They made profits every day, and every day on which the factory was idle meant so much clear loss. Besides all this, there was another point. The English capitalist undertakers were the first to whom the trade-unions were opposed. These men saw the new movement only in its beginnings, and did not realize to what dimensions it would grow, and how powerful it might become. They were not, therefore, actuated by the fear which has made all capitalist undertakers to-day inimical to the movement—the fear that the organized working classes might one day succeed to their position as the directors of production.

After all, why should they not have favoured protective legislation for the workers? Even if it increased the cost of production, the consumer might easily be made to pay more. But there was no need for the cost of production to be increased. If the hours of labour were decreased, that was balanced by an increase in the intensity of labour. And so it was to the advantage of the employers to have skilled workers, and to pay them well. The balance might be achieved by improved methods, and improved methods were easily possible, for capital flowed in abundance, and the demands of the market increased steadily. Last of all, protective legislation for the workers gave the bigger masters a splendid weapon with which to crush the small ones, who were not able to carry out the requirements of the Factory Acts. It was all done with an eye to increasing and intensifying the work of production which the ever-growing markets demanded.

It is clear that by adopting such a policy the ruling classes in England showed that they possessed no small measure of political insight. And when we think of the English type of the Social Movement we shall have to remember the long political history of England, up to the point where that movement commenced.

To my knowledge the English type has been reproduced but once, and that in the United States of America. Here, too, Socialism has made but slow progress all through the nineteenth century; here, too, the trade-union movement has grown by leaps and bounds, and has shown a certain tendency to be select, and limited only to one particular caste. But co-operation is almost non-existent in America. That our explanation of the peculiar English conditions is correct is shown by the fact that in the United States we may see similar political and economic causes at work. The same causes have had the same effects.

In America, too, there has been a wonderful extension of economic activity. The huge extent of the union, and the protective duties have combined to ensure a large market to its quickly-growing industries. Hence, and also because of the great fertility of the soil and the great productivity of labour, profits became immense, and the working classes participated in the national wealth. The consequence is that the standard of life of the American working man is, on an average, twice or three times that of the working man in Europe.

The political conditions in America are such that it would be difficult for a Labour movement which was opposed to the State and society to take root. The broad, democratic constitution gives every working man the feeling that he is of some importance in the State. Moreover, the two-party-system has the same consequences in the United States as in England; on the one hand, it prevents the rise of a third, Independent Labour party; and, on the other, it makes the formation of such a party unnecessary. Lastly, we must not forget that until recently the United States had a strongly colonial character. Until not very long ago there was so much free land that it was possible for every man who was strong and willing to work to make himself economically independent as a farmer. That meant that there were opportunities for the working classes to get rid of the "cash nexus" which bound them to the

capitalist system. Hence the opposition to the capitalist system was not of necessity very keen, and there was little room for a movement the purpose of which was to abolish it.

Bearing in mind, then, the economic and political conditions amid which the American proletariat lives, we shall easily understand why it should have stood aloof from Socialism even longer than the English proletariat.

In conclusion, let us bear in mind what the English (and American) movement of the working classes has contributed to the proletarian movement as a whole. Apart from the valuable experiences in the organization and management of trade-unions and co-operative societies, this has been persistence, calmness, business-like procedure, and especially self-confidence. It is, in a word, the *method* of the movement that the proletariat received from the English type, and that method will remain the possession of the proletariat, even if it should itself develop along new lines.

II. THE FRENCH TYPE

We now leave England and go to France. What a different scene! England with its fog and smoke and leaden skies, France with its brightness, its sunny aspect and its warm climate! The Englishman, earnest, practical and plodding; the Frenchman, quick-witted, light-hearted and artistic in temperament!

What of the Social Movement in France? I have already indicated one or two characteristics in a general way. We may say its chief feature is its nervousness. It has been bubbling and boiling continuously ever since the "glorious" Revolution. Parties arise and fall to pieces; first one policy is adopted, and then another; one day it is the struggle for political power; the next, this policy is succeeded by bloody street fights, or by conspiracies and assassinations. It is as though a fire were burn-

ing in the souls of the masses and their leaders, and whenever opportunity offers it breaks out of hand and devours all things around. The Social Movement in France was always morbid, excitable and convulsive. Now it was a mighty force, grand in its sudden outburst; then, again, when the first disappointments were experienced, it became weary and motionless. It was always far-seeing and brilliant; but at the same time it chased will-o'-the-wisps and unrealities. Never certain as to its methods, it always had great faith in the effectiveness of speedy and sudden action, whether it was registering a vote or using a dagger. But, throughout, it had a firm belief that revolutions could work miracles. For this reason I have called the French type of the Social Movement Revolutionary. This characteristic includes all the others—Factionism, Clubism and Putschism.¹ The first describes the tendency to split up into innumerable small parties; the second is the desire for setting on foot conspiracies in secret societies and midnight meetings; and the third is the name given to street riots, and to the belief in barricades.

Historically, these characteristics occurred in the opposite order to that here given. Clubism and Putschism prevailed first, and Factionism came later.

The year 1871 is the dividing line. Before that year, but especially in the fourth and fifth decades of the century, numerous secret societies were established and abolished, all of them constituted on the model of the clubs of 1748 and 1793, all of them filled with the spirit of the Carbonari and similar secret societies. The subterranean movement culminated in the supremely radical *Société des Travailleurs égaux*.

France, it may be noted in passing, was the home of the "modern" policy of bomb-throwing. We need but recall

¹ After careful consideration I have decided to retain these terms as they stand in the original. Their meaning is made quite clear, and the narrative gains perhaps in picturesqueness. The first may be rendered by *factionousness*, the second by *plotting*, and the third by *riot*.

the attempt on Bonaparte on December 24, 1800, and on Louis Philippe on July 28, 1835.

The proletariat next pinned their faith to street barricades. The Revolution of 1848 was in France—as opposed to all other lands—predominantly proletarian. The revolution of February was ended by the sending of two representatives of the working classes (Louis Blanc and Albert) to the *Gouvernement provisoire*; the debates at Luxembourg were mostly on the demands of the working classes, and the establishment and closing of the national workshops was the great question of the day. Then came the Revolution of June, with the greatest street fights which the proletariat ever fought. Finally, in 1871, it rose again to fight for its rights once more. The rising of the Commune took place at a time when, in England, a million organized workers were discussing questions of the day, with good sense and in a practical spirit, at the Trade-Union Congress. In France it was the end of the period of secret plots and mighty revolutions.

That did not mean the total disappearance of the revolutionary spirit in France. There are a large number of Frenchmen to-day who are as ready as their fathers and grandfathers were to kindle the flame of revolution if opportunity offered; who look with envy at the fearless tactics of the Russian revolutionaries, and who declare that all modern Socialism is sinking into the bog of inaction, and becoming a purely bourgeois movement. It is impossible to withhold a smile in listening to the talk of these old-fashioned revolutionaries. Only recently I had an opportunity of chatting to one of these "heroes." Yes, heroes, that is what they undoubtedly are; and that is why they appear to us, who are in danger of losing ourselves in a shallow realism and opportunism, as representatives of an earlier age which had a broader outlook and deeper feelings, much like so many Don Quixotes in the midst of ordinary men. It was in Berlin that we met, in the city where order and military discipline reach a high standard of perfection. He had not words enough to

express his scorn of the German Social Democracy, which in his view, had grown weak and shallow and middle class, and was to-day the greatest foe of revolutions. I asked him whether, in face of quick-firing rifles, grape shot and long, straight streets, he still believed in the efficacy of street fights. He replied with a somewhat superior smile that of course he did. Why, preparations for revolution had been going on all the time; they had not rested; and their revolutionary tactics had been developed just as the "ruling classes" had developed their military tactics. Modern technical knowledge had been relied on; dynamite and other combustibles had been taken into the service of the men who thought as he did. Moreover, their policy of defence had been organized to suit the general character of modern streets. "Look here, if there were to be a battle in this street" (this was in the West End of Berlin, and as he said this he jumped up and went to the window in order to show me the topography of the street), "we should organize our position in this wise. . . ." Let it be remembered that this was no raw youth that was speaking; it was a man of large experience and vast knowledge. But he did not call himself a Nihilist or an Anarchist; he insisted that he was a Socialist. There are not many of his way of thinking among German Socialists; but in France this type of man is still strong. The followers of Blanqui are of this kind—perhaps the purest of them, and the other socialist parties in France contain thousands of a similar character.

The French Socialists are more akin to revolutionary Conventicle-men, who spring up to-day and vanish to-morrow, than to a well-organized parliamentary party. Their history is for many years the history of factions. No sooner did a number of men combine in the common cause than disagreement broke out among them, and personal opposition destroyed an excellent programme at one blow. Instability is the prevailing characteristic. One need but consider a date or two. In 1879 Jules Guesde founded the first modern Socialist Labour party in France.

This was broken up in the following year by the secession of the "Progressives." In 1880 the followers of Guesde combined on the basis of a programme which Marx drew up for them; but in the next year a large number, under the leadership of Paul Brousse, rebelled. The consequence was that in 1882 there were the parties of Guesde and Brousse. Very soon the Allemannists split off from the latter, and in the same way the Failletists left the Allemannists. Even in the latest epoch in the history of French Socialism, when it is an ordinary parliamentary party, the words I used above still hold good in large measure: "It has been bubbling and boiling continuously."

It is in accord with this picture of the Social Movement in France that France, right down to the present day, is the nursery of Anarchism. We have sought to explain in our account of socialist ideas the fact that the revolutionary tactics of many Anarchists stand in close relation to the belief (which may be traced as far back as Robespierre) in the necessity of Terror if men are to pass from the rule of Folly and Hate to that of Reason and Love. Blanqui, whose name is used to describe one of the socialist parties in France, is the connecting link between the Mountain party and modern Anarchists (in so far as they are Terrorists). But, even so, there is no very great difference in the shades of opinion between these parties.

That the latest development of Socialism in France, Revolutionary Syndicalism, has a strong dash of the thoughts of the Anarchists and of Blanqui, we have already seen.

Now it is clear that the peculiar characteristics of French Socialism must be explained by reference to the French national character.

To begin with, it is perfectly plain to all those who are acquainted with French history that the peculiarities in the movement of the proletariat in France can all be seen in the struggles of the French lower middle class. Indeed, it may be said that the proletariat took over the legacy of the lower middle class. The one movement passed

imperceptibly into the other. The influence of the lower middle class on the proletariat was apparent when the latter began a movement of its own. This affected not merely the method of the struggle; it also extended to a number of the ideas of the new movement in its programmes and ideals. This was the case for a long time, and it explains why Proudhon, the greatest theorist of the revolutionary lower middle class, had so great an influence in French proletarian circles as late as 1848. It has been often questioned, I know, whether Proudhon was a lower-middle-class theorist, but it is none the less true. His phraseology may sound revolutionary, but all his proposals, whether his exchange and credit bank, or the fixing of value, have one end in view, and that is to maintain individual production and exchange, to strengthen them, to put them on a moral basis.

But those who are acquainted with the facts will not be surprised to note the prevailing influence of the lower middle class on the proletarian movement in France. In the course of modern French history this class, especially in Paris, won for itself no small influence in the eyes of the nation. Many were the laurels that it obtained since the days of 1793. As in no other country—with the exception, perhaps, of Italy—the lower middle class has shown itself to be brave, bold and successful. No one will doubt that if the French middle classes, as no other in all the world, were able after so short a time to move along an unimpeded path by the sweeping away of feudal institutions, it was due to a large extent to the iron broom of Napoleon. But we must not forget that it was the Revolution of 1793—the revolution of the lower middle class—that prepared the way for what was to come after. In this lies the importance of the Reign of Terror, and of the class which brought it about.

That, at any rate, is the ideal side of the influence of the lower middle class on the proletarian movement in France. But side by side with that is the fact that a great part of the characteristically French industries, thanks to

their peculiar organization in workshops, are still of the nature of handicrafts, and therefore industries on a small scale. Most of them, indeed, require artistic skill. Take the silk industry of Lyons, or the numerous Paris industries that minister to the wants of the wealthy. They are totally different from the great English staple industries of coal, iron and cotton. The French workman (in Lyons he is even called the master workman) is thus able, by reason of special organization and the peculiar tendencies, to give many French industries a more individualist, and therefore lower-middle-class, character than the proletarian in other lands.

The lower-middle-class character in the organization of French industry is paralleled by the prevalence of the small peasant proprietor in French agriculture. That appears to me an important point to notice. For it explains the strong anarchist tendency in the Social Movement in France. There is clearly a deep sympathy for Anarchism on the part of the peasantry. Wherever Anarchism has taken any strong hold on the popular mind, it was in country districts. For an illustration, we need but recall Bakunin's success in Italy and in Spain, and the fact that Anarchism is once more taking root in France. Indeed, wherever the country population managed to set an independent movement on foot, there was generally an element of anarchist teaching in it. Once again we may quote Spain and Italy as examples, and also Ireland. Perhaps this is due to the fact that Anarchism does not lay especial stress on communist aims. The small peasant proprietor will incline to support a movement which promises a heaven on earth, but at the same time allows him the continued enjoyment of his own little farm. The low standard of intelligence among peasant populations does the rest.

But when all is said, the explanation for the special characteristics of the Social Movement in France—if you will, a legacy from the lower middle-class—the explanation of the enthusiasm for revolution is to be found in the

French national character and in the whole history of the country. The nation as a whole is light-hearted and easily moved; it has a fiery temperament and is subject to sudden bursts of zeal, both of which are lacking in northern peoples. The French type of the Social Movement, tempered, it is true, by German influences, is just now springing up in Italy, and we may there observe its characteristics—how its enthusiasm spreads, how large masses come to agree as though in a lightning flash, how the fire of excitement flares up and dies down as quickly as a fire of straw. We perceive quite a different mode of thinking and feeling in the French, or Romance type of the born revolutionary, from that of the English worker who stands at the other pole. As Victor Hehn says somewhere of the Italian (though the description might apply equally well to all other Romance nations), "He is very different from the German, to say nothing of the English average man; he cannot conceive the nature of those well-meaning and unimaginative children of habit, who, possessing all the common virtues and having but few wants, go through life slowly carrying the prejudices of their fathers with touching patience."

One special mark of the Frenchman (as of all the Romance peoples) is that he has a much stronger tendency to accept judgments formed by individuals. Ideas in France, more than in northern lands, become popular when they are expressed by strong personalities. The living mind, therefore, has more influence on the masses than printed thought and abstract doctrine. Hence it comes about that in France propaganda by personal effort is so effective; hence, too, the tendency to follow leaders, and, therefore, the splitting up into parties. With the less artistic temperament of the northern peoples it is more the respect for an impersonal cause or idea that tends to unite the masses.

The history of this wonderful people is, of course, only the expression of its inmost nature, but history itself has developed this, and, therefore, if we are to have a full understanding of social phenomena, we must regard

it as an independent factor. The first thing that the observer cannot help noticing is the very great influence which Paris has had in the fortunes of France. Now in Paris the neurotic traits in the national character are naturally most marked, and it was Paris which in the long run shaped the Social Movement in France.

But the latest history of France is only the history of a series of revolutions, and these could not but strengthen the natural tendency of the French to revolution. I always have the feeling that the French people to-day are still under the influence, perhaps the baneful influence, of their "glorious revolution." An event of this kind, the most powerful drama on the stage of history, is not easily forgotten by a people in the course of a hundred years. Do we not find that the greatest national festival is on the day when the revolution is recalled? I believe that that nervousness which may be seen in French public life is partly a legacy from those terrible days of general subversion, a legacy which is still cultivated in less glorious revolution—alas! so many!

Prince Kropotkin has a very apposite remark somewhere. He says: "If France is the vanguard of the revolution, if the French people is revolutionary in spirit and in temperament, it is just because it has made so many of those revolutions which have been condemned by doctrinaires and simpletons."

When we recall how much in the outward forms of the public life in France has been changed by revolutions, we shall quite easily understand the great faith of Frenchmen in revolutions. We shall understand that the revolutionary spirit has been carried from the political sphere into that of social change; especially when we bear in mind that it was in France that rational Socialism arose, that in France the belief in a "natural order" which might be brought about to-morrow was most congenial to the national spirit, and that, therefore, those ideas which fed the thought of revolution should have continued in France for so long.

We have already seen that the newest movement in Socialism, Revolutionary Syndicalism, is in accord with the spirit of the revolutionary people. We shall see in due course how the new Social Movement which it has inspired is beginning to develop along the old revolutionary lines.

III. THE GERMAN TYPE

In Germany the Social Movement is distinguished by its prevailingly political character, and this finds expression in the tardy recognition of the trade-union and the co-operative movements as equally important factors; it is marked by its anti-revolutionary and strictly parliamentary tactics; and its chief characteristic is its complete absorption of the Marxian ideas.

Let us recall a few of the most important events in its history and we shall see the truth of this conception.

The modern proletarian movement in Germany commences, as is well known, with the appearance of Lassalle. The Social Democratic party celebrated its fortieth birthday on the 23rd of May 1903, and thus showed that it began to reckon its existence from the day on which Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-64) established the General Workers' Union of Germany (*Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein*).

It is true that the agitation created by Lassalle was very powerful indeed; true that the few months which he devoted to the workers' cause contained many more dramatic episodes than all the long years which followed. Yet the activity of Lassalle was not long enough to give a permanent direction to the Labour movement. This did, indeed, adopt the principal points in his programme, and it has kept them ever since; it did for a long time adopt the policy, on which Lassalle laid special stress, of ignoring the trade-unions and the co-operative movement. Yet the spirit with which it was to be filled in

the years of its growth was not that of Lassalle, but of Marx.

It was in Geneva on the 28th of August 1864 that the fatal bullet entered Lassalle's breast, and when he died he left but a bubble behind him. The General Workers' Union of Germany had only 4,610 members on the day when its founder breathed his last, and during the first years that followed, the movement was occupied over petty squabbles concerning small things. Designed to become a political party, in reality it turned into a petty clique. The result was that there was an open field in Germany in which a new Social Democratic movement might develop. This was started in 1864 by William Liebknecht, who had been sent to Germany by Marx for the special purpose of establishing the Labour movement on a purely Marxian basis. Liebknecht was fortunate enough to obtain the assistance of Augustus Bebel, a young turner, twenty-four years of age, who was already chairman of a number of working-men's educational societies, the tone of which was distinctly advanced radical. These societies, with a membership of 14,000, decided at the conference in Nuremberg in 1868 to leave Schulze-Delitzsch and follow Marx. The resolution which pledged them to this step was drawn up by Liebknecht and breathes the spirit of Marx in every line. Thus a new Socialist party was founded in Germany. It called itself the Social Democratic Labour party, and after the Congress in Eisenach, came to be spoken of as the "honest party," and continued its independent existence for some time. But at Gotha, in 1875, the two wings of the movement joined forces; the party of Lassalle combining with that of Bebel and Liebknecht. Ever since there has been but one Social Democratic party in Germany. It is of very great importance to note that although the combination came about as a result of compromise between the followers of Lassalle and Marx, yet it was the Marxists that began to direct the policy of the party, and their influence grew more and

more in the course of years. The Gotha Programme was for sixteen years the foundation on which the movement in Germany stood, and only in 1891 was it replaced by the Erfurt Programme, which ever since has remained the creed of the German Social Democrats. It is thoroughly Marxian in spirit, and expresses the Marxian dogmas in a form modified in accordance with the needs of the day—something of a parallel to Luther's edition of the Apostles' Creed.

I shall quote the fundamental portion of the programme in full, so that the reader, by comparing it with what I have said concerning the system of Marx, may see how full it is of the *spiritus Marxii purus*.

"The economic development of society must of necessity destroy production on a small scale, the foundation of which is the private ownership by the labourer of the instruments of production. For it separates the labourer from his instruments of production and turns him into a poor proletarian. In the meantime the instruments of production become the monopoly of a comparatively small number of Capitalists and landlords.

"Hand in hand with this monopolization of the instruments of production there is a tendency for production on a large scale to push production on a small scale out of existence, for an extended use of machinery, and for a huge increase in the productivity of human labour. But all advantages arising from these changes are monopolized by the Capitalists and landowners. For the proletariat and the sinking middle classes—the small shopkeepers and the peasants—the new state of things means uncertainty of tenure, misery, oppression, slavery, humiliation, exploitation.

"The proletariat is constantly increasing in number, the army of the unemployed is growing more and more, the opposition between the spoilers and the spoiled becomes increasingly more and more marked, and the class war between bourgeoisie and proletariat is becoming every day more intense, thus splitting modern society into two hostile camps—a state of things which is prevalent in all industrial countries.

"The gulf between the 'haves' and the 'have nots' is being widened by commercial crises, which are part and parcel of the capitalist means of production. These appear and re-appear more extensively; they make the existing uncertainty the normal state of modern society, and prove conclusively that the powers of production in modern society have grown out of hand, and that the private ownership of the instruments of production is incompatible with their most economic application and highest development.

"Private ownership of the instruments of production which before was the means of securing the ready-made product to the producer, is to-day the means of exploiting peasants, manual labourers and small dealers, and of giving to the idle classes—the Capitalists and

the landlords—the possession of the produce of the worker's labour. There is only one way of turning production on a large scale, and the increased productivity of the work of the community from being a source of misery and oppression to the exploited classes into one of happiness and general perfection, and that is to transform capitalist ownership of the instruments of production—land and mines, raw material, tools, machinery, means of communication and so forth—into socialist ownership, and to replace private production by socialist production in the interests of all.

"The social change will bring about the liberation not only of the proletariat, but also of the whole of mankind, which suffers under existing conditions. It can be effected only by the working classes, since all other classes, despite the clash of interests among themselves, stand on the basis of private ownership of the instruments of production, and to support existing social conditions is an aim common to them all.

"The struggle of the working classes against capitalist exploitation must of necessity be a political struggle. The working classes cannot fight its economic battles nor develop its economic organization unless it possesses political rights. It cannot bring about the transference of the instruments of production into the hands of society unless it has obtained political power.

"To shape this struggle of the working classes aright, to give it unity and self-consciousness, to point out what is its specific aim—all this is the task of the Social Democratic party.

"In all lands where production is on capitalist lines, the interests of the workers are the same. As international communication is extended, and as production is more and more for the world market, the condition of the workers in any country becomes more and more dependent on that of the workers in all other countries. Accordingly, the liberation of the working classes is a task in which the workers of all civilized countries may participate equally. It is in view of this that the Social Democratic party in Germany regards itself as being at one with the proletarians of all other lands.

"The Social Democratic party in Germany strives, therefore, not for new class privileges and rights, but for the removal of class rule, and, indeed, of class differences. It demands similar rights and similar duties for all, without distinction of sex or descent. From this standpoint it attacks the exploitation and oppression not only of the wage-earners, but also all manner of exploitation and oppression, against any class, any party, any sex or any race."

In accordance with this programme, German Social Democracy began in 1867 to fight for political power. It appealed to the voters in order to get a footing in the German Reichstag. In this orderly parliamentary struggle it was the first, and in its splendid success it became a model to the Social Democracies of other lands. We may see how typically German this aspect of the Social Movement is from the fact that to the end of the eighteenth-seventies the votes for German members were practically

the only socialist votes in all the world. Thus, in 1878, of the 438,231 socialist votes in all lands, 437,158 were cast in Germany and the rest in Denmark. Even in 1890 the German socialist votes were five-sixths of the entire socialist votes in all countries (1,427,298 out of 1,794,060). And to-day the votes registered for the German Social Democrats (3,259,020) are certainly one half of all the votes registered in favour of socialist candidates. Austria comes next, but it is a long way behind, with its 1,041,948 votes.

To account for the peculiarity of the Labour movement in Germany we shall, I think, have to lay more stress on the importance of personal (and therefore accidental) influence than elsewhere. That this influence was stronger in shaping the destinies of the movement in Germany than in other lands was due partly to the immense importance of the men who took part in the foundation of the German Labour party. Both Lassalle and Marx, as is well known, have been canonized by the proletariat. Lassalle, because of his mighty personality and his tragic fate—

“God’s acre in Breslau containeth his grave,
He sleeps there, the hero, who swords to us gave,”—

and Marx because of the grandeur of his ideas. But it was due in some measure also to the low state of development of German economic life and German politics at the time when the socialist agitation commenced. Besides, there is always scope for personal influence in the early stages of any movement. Now, while the influence of Marx on the German Labour movement was of a positive kind, the influence of Lassalle, as it seems to me, was more negative. The slow growth and recognition of trade-unions and of co-operation in Germany was due partly to the insufficient understanding, on the part of Lassalle, of the importance of these movements for the proletarian struggle and his dislike of them in consequence, a dislike which his followers took over from him, some of them, it is to be feared, quite blindly.

Lassalle's whole conception of historic development was totally opposed to the idea of the trade-unions. He appears to have had no clear understanding of conditions in England. Indeed, the English trade-unions were first introduced to German scholars through the writings of Brentano, and were imitated in actual practice by Hirsch in the early eighteen-seventies. This explains why Lassalle in his "Open Letter," although mentioning co-operative stores and similar societies, says not a word about trade-unions. It explains also how he could write sentences such as these in his attack on Schulze: "There is no way out of these social conditions by means of social action. The vain attempts to give expression to the idea that the workers are men may be seen in the English strikes, and it is well known what miserable failures these were. No. The only course for the workers to adopt in order to improve their position is to utilize the State machinery which still regards them as men. In the long run the State will have to do this, and hence the boundless, instinctive hate of the Liberal bourgeoisie against the conception of the State in all its forms."

It may be mentioned that the Marxian spirit was at first opposed to the development of trade-unions in Germany for reasons which I have set forth at length in my little book on the trade-union movement. But then Marx did not understand that movement. Lassalle did give it some consideration, but only to prove its complete uselessness for the purpose of the proletarian struggle. As is well known, his belief in the iron law of wages led him to this conclusion. His condemnation of co-operative societies may be found in the "Open Letter," and runs as follows: "The co-operative societies will never be of use to the whole body of workers. They may, indeed, serve some purpose to the individual workers who combine to form them, but only as long as their example is not followed to any great extent. For, as the co-operative societies increase, and are joined by more and more workers, the little good which accrued to the original

members will disappear, until on the day when the co-operative societies include the greater part of the working classes, it becomes nothing at all."

But when all is said, the objective conditions in which the Social Movement in Germany grew up must have been such as to make the influence of these men possible.

Is there any connection, we wonder, between the characteristics of the Social Movement in Germany and the German national character? If so, it will be due in the first place to the fact that your German is a born doctrinaire. He has a fondness for theorizing and systematizing, which makes it easy for him to master the intricacies of the Marxian world of thought, and then, like the great believer in dogma that he is, not to swerve from the system when once it has been accepted. He is attracted by "the principle of the thing." It is characteristic of the people, of "poets and thinkers," and also, it may be added, of schoolmasters, that the programme of a party of radical opposition commences with an extract from a treatise on sociology. "You hide your impotence," Jaurès twitted the Germans at the Amsterdam Congress, "behind the verbiage of mere theoretic formulas, which your distinguished comrade Kautsky will supply you with until the end of his days." But while the Germans have this love of theoretic speculation, they lack that practical spirit which distinguishes the Englishman and the American; besides which they have a distaste for grappling with practical questions of everyday politics. And what marks off the German from the Frenchman (and all Romance peoples) is that he is not a good hand at revolution. I believe the Germans are the most submissive people on the face of the globe, and as for being aroused, they have not the capacity for it. At most, any feeling of dissatisfaction is expressed in some satirical poem or learned controversial pamphlet. In action—never. The only revolution which the Germans attempted, that of the year 1848, has, with the exception of, perhaps, one or two incidents, a distinctly comic aspect to all those

who possess a sense of humour, and despite all revolutionary phraseology it was a very tame affair. One need but look at the caricatures and the comic papers of the time to see that the helmets of the heroes were only night caps.

Once again we must look to the peculiar circumstances of the time for some influence on the German Social Movement.

A real revolutionary movement in Germany—assuming for a moment that the German character was not incompatible with it—would have been impossible simply because it was too late. The revolutionary movement as it appeared in France bears on the face of it signs of immaturity. But even so, once there it was able to stay. It could not, however, come suddenly at a late period of development; and it did not come in Germany, because when the German Social Movement began, the time was past for revolutionary tendencies to become guiding principles.

On the other hand, Germany at the time was economically undeveloped; it was, perhaps, in the stage that England had reached towards the end of the eighteenth century. This may be another reason why the trade-union movement was such a long way behind the movement for political agitation.

Under the given conditions, since the proletariat had entered on a parliamentary policy, it might have been expected that, as in other lands, it would attempt to join hands with the existing parties of opposition. That was not the case, because the bourgeois parties in Germany in these days were too weak to adopt a Radical policy, and were, therefore, unable to merge with the proletariat.

It is one of the legacies of the year 1848 that Liberalism in Germany is characterized by an unholy fear of the red peril. We know how the middle-class movement of that year lost all its effectiveness, and those who took part in it fled to take shelter behind the Prussian bayonets as soon as the "evilly minded persons"—the democratic elements that are to be found in all revolutions (think of

the French Revolution)—began to come to the surface. All civic pride and sturdy independence went to the winds; and the comedy was repeated as soon as the peril of the social revolution became visible on the horizon, no matter how far away (think of the law against Socialists). Thus it came to pass that the bridge between the proletarian movement and the parties of opposition was broken down completely.

In the sphere of politics, then, the fear and dread of the red peril in the ranks of Liberalism prevented the rise of a determined Radical policy which very probably would have contented the proletariat for a long time. In the economic sphere, Liberalism was no better advised. It was extremely doctrinaire in its views; it clung thoughtlessly to the doctrines of the Manchester school, which became dull and dreary as the bookworms developed them. Schulze Delitsch was certainly an important personage, but his efforts to bridge over the gulf between the proletariat and the different Liberal parties were utterly hopeless. The Liberal Economists of those days were blind to the demands of the proletariat, and could not understand the Social Movement. Of all treatises on the so-called Labour Question by distinguished scholars of many lands, I know of none so pitiful as that of Prince-Smith in Germany.

That the Liberal parties showed how incapable they were of turning the growing proletarian forces to their own advantage may be seen in an incident which occurred in 1862. A deputation of workers from Leipzig was sent to the National party with a view to an arrangement whereby the proletariat might participate in political life. What was the answer they got from the leaders of the National party? That working-men could become only honorary members of the party!

Into a political system of this kind, where parties stood in such a peculiar relation to each other, Bismarck in 1867 introduced universal suffrage and voting by ballot. That was of fundamental importance for the Social Movement

in Germany in two ways. On the one hand, the suffrage weakened the already powerless bourgeoisie, which, between the Junker party and the proletariat, became more and more insignificant, and which was so frightened by the growing Labour party that it completely lost its self-reliance. We thus find a growing coolness between the Liberal parties and the proletarian movement. On the other hand, the democratic suffrage which the proletariat had so easily obtained forced the party more and more to adopt a parliamentary policy, and prevented the leaders of the movement for a long time from paying heed to other than parliamentary aspects of the Social Movement.

Now, as German Liberalism became tamer and tamer, and finally threw away the last remnants of Radical demands, the Social Democratic party was forced more and more to undertake the guardianship of Liberal ideas in Germany, and in so doing attracted to itself no small number of non-socialist adherents. According to the most reliable calculation, the three million social democratic votes of the last election contained no less than 750,000 which were non-socialist.

The reactionary policy of the German, and more especially of the Prussian Government, has been responsible for the fact that the non-Socialists have remained in the Social Democratic party. Whenever the party structure was on the point of breaking up, the Government's policy very soon strengthened the hoops about it again. Take the law against Socialists. What other Socialist party had so excellent a means of agitation as the German Social Democrats, to say nothing of such terms as the now famous "Rabble of unpatriotic good-for-nothings"?

And now let us see what part of the German type of the Social Movement is likely to continue in the future. In the first place, of course, the method of procedure on legal and parliamentary lines. Secondly, the teachings of Marx—in so far, that is, as they possess vitality; and with this, to my mind, the fundamental idea on which the whole movement is to be based.

CHAPTER III

THE TENDENCY TO UNIFORMITY

PREFATORY

IN previous editions this chapter was somewhat shorter than it is at present, yet it was just this particular portion of my work that has met with much opposition in non-socialist circles. My assertion that there is a tendency to uniformity in the Social Movement was adversely criticized as being "utterly wrong," just as my view that there are two layers in the system of Marx was criticized by the Socialists. Only recently Professor Conrad¹ in one of his "Outlines of Economics" wrote as follows, and no doubt he expresses the common prevailing non-socialist view—

"It is utterly wrong to assert, as Sombart and others do, that every Labour movement, because it sets itself against the superior power of Capital, must become socialist in character. Facts prove the exact opposite. In the United States of America and in Australia there is, as in England, a powerful Labour movement, but in both (?) countries, it has nothing in the least socialistic about it. It is merely (!) a struggle of the workers against the masters for a greater share in the products of the common labour and for general improvements in the condition of the workers. This struggle in both (?) lands is purely individualistic; there is not the slightest desire to touch private property, which is the foundation on which the modern State is based, or to meddle with private production."

In spite of this assertion I still maintain the view I

¹ Professor of Political Economy in Halle.

held that there is a distinct tendency in the Social Movement to uniformity. I believe that while, ten years ago, there was, perhaps, some little ground for doubting this truth, to-day there can be no possible doubt about it. If ever a view has been proved correct by history, it is this view which I put forward.

It may be that capable critics were not convinced of the correctness of my thesis because its presentation in previous editions was perhaps all too brief. I have, therefore, in the present edition very much extended this chapter, which is probably the most important in the whole book, and I have tried to give as broad and thorough a presentation of the problem as possible.

Just a word or two by way of preface to make my meaning more clear. By the term "tendency to uniformity" I mean two things. I mean, first, the tendency to unity of action on the part of the Labour parties in all countries; that is to say, to the "internationalization" of the movement. This is treated in the first sub-section of the present chapter. Then I also mean the tendency towards inner unity in the movement in each particular country. This tendency will show itself in two ways. In the first place, it will be seen in the tendency towards unity in the Socialist, or Social Democratic, party itself; and in the second place, in the tendency of the movement in all lands towards Socialism. I have tried to show in the second sub-section the lines along which Social Democracy is beginning more and more to move, and I have done so by referring to the transactions of the International Socialist Congresses. In the following chapter we shall see (1) how far the socialist movement in each country is in accord with the principles laid down at the international congresses, and (2) that the Social Movement as a whole is adopting many important parts of the Social Democratic programme.

In order to remove all possibility of further misconception I should like to call attention to two things. In the first place, it is necessary to distinguish between

appearance and reality in the course of the Social Movement. The one is seen in words; the other in deeds. To judge any social movement according to the speeches or the articles of its leaders would be to obtain an entirely false view of it. For example, the phraseology of the Labour leaders in America will for a very long time to come be anti-socialist, just as in Germany it will be spiced with revolutionary terms. But that does not affect the fact that the American working classes will continue along the lines of Socialism (on which they have already entered) any more than that the German working classes will be filled more and more with a realistic, evolutionary spirit. We should, therefore, not pay too much attention to the squabbles in the trade-unions or in the political Labour parties, but rather try to see what lies behind the wordy war between Bebel and Vollmar, Ferri and Turati, Guesde and Jaurès. I hope to deal with this point fully.

In the second place, it must be noted that I always speak of *tendencies* to uniformity. In previous editions I explained my meaning as follows—

“My view of the apparent unity of the Social Movement does not mean that I believe the social movements in every country will have an exact resemblance, like so many pins in a row. I am not blind to the endless varieties which may be found in different countries. Indeed, I have myself attempted to show that these national differences are inevitable, and thanks to historic tradition and national characteristics, will continue up to a certain point. And so when I talk of uniformity or of likeness, I mean the tendency which is making in that direction, and is opposed to national differences. The Social Movement will always develop in two ways, one centripetal, the other centrifugal. The first, because of the sameness of capitalist development in all lands: the same cause will tend to the same result. The second, because of national differences: dissimilar causes will tend to produce dissimilar results.”

That is still my view to-day. I should like to lay

special stress on it, because I believe the misapprehensions that have arisen are due to the fact that sufficient regard was not had to the word "tendency."

I. "PROLETARIANS OF ALL LANDS, UNITE!"

Karl Marx concluded his *Manifesto* with these words. It was on the eve of the revolution of 1848 that the call went forth, but it was answered by few voices. The revolution of that year, which here and there was proletarian and socialist in its nature, soon became utterly played out in every corner of the globe where it had started, and in Germany, where at the time Karl Marx was on the flood-tide of fortune, it did not achieve even one thing of importance. In England it seemed as though the February revolution might breathe new life into the decrepit Chartist movement. But it was too late; the Chartist movement was hopelessly dead. And so only the revolution in France remained, and every one knows how that ended. Then the night of reaction settled over Europe. All attempts at an independent Social Labour movement were nipped in the bud. The only exception was the growth of the trade-union movement in England.

Nevertheless, the political reaction of the day did not for a moment delay the march of the social revolution. That was prevented by the Californian and Australian gold which gave Capitalism a new and powerful impetus. Strange play of fortune, that its discovery should have been made in the year 1848! The "dark" eighteen-fifties were at the same time a sunny, golden period for the capitalist world, such as no other had been, and so the proletarian shadow became darker.

By the beginning of the eighteen-sixties new life showed itself once more among the labouring classes. They

gradually recovered from the blows and oppressions of the 1848 movement and after, and a desire to participate in public life made itself manifest. The remarkable thing about it was that this participation soon got an international character. That, of course, was no accident, any more than it was an accident that the workers of different countries joined hands at an international exhibition. The fact was that Capitalism had developed into an international thing. The continental countries imitated England. For the first time, by a series of treaties, commercial policy was made international and economic life in Europe was unified.

Now the idea of internationalism never quite disappeared from the proletarian movement ever since the early eighteen-sixties, though it has received many modifications in the course of years.

The first attempt at an international combination of the proletariat was the famous International Workmen's Association. In 1862 French workers in London, at the International Exhibition, put themselves into communication with English workers and talked over their common interests and common action. There were further meetings, and in 1864 a union was founded with the object of uniting representatives of workers from different lands in one common policy. That became the International Workmen's Union (*L'Association des Travailleurs; die Internationale Arbeiterassoziation*).

One of two things could become the aim of such a fraternal organization. On the one hand, it might establish a sort of correspondence bureau, an international office, to which workers in different lands could apply for information on the development of the Social Movement. Such an institution would not have had any influence on the Labour movement in each country. The majority of the men who in those early days entertained the idea of an international federation thought of it, no doubt, only in this loose form.

But there was another conception of the aim of such an

organization, and that was to make it a centre for the whole Labour movement, a place from which the proletarian organizations in each country should receive their orders, and to which they should look for encouragement; a centre for the entire direction of each local Labour movement. The most important representative of this view was Karl Marx, who was destined to play a great part at the foundation of the International Workmen's Association. The new association was the first answer to his call, "Proletarians of all lands, unite!" Marx did not doubt for a moment that if a centre was to be created for the unification of the national Labour movements, it would have to be his spirit which should influence it. But he was wise enough to see that for the present great caution would be necessary if the union of so many different tendencies was to be accomplished.

The International Workmen's Union was founded on the so-called "Inaugural Address" as a basis, and that, as well as its rules, was formulated by Marx. A good deal of diplomatic skill is revealed in both documents. The Inaugural Address was a model of diplomatic ingenuity. It was nebulous in meaning, and that of set purpose. For its object was to unite all sections of the Labour movement—the followers of Proudhon and the co-operatives in France; the trade-unionists in England; the disciples of Mazzini in Italy, and those of Lassalle in Germany—and it succeeded remarkably well. It was just to all parties. It described in touching language the misery into which the working classes were sunk by reason of Capital, but at the same time it had a word of admiration for the success of the English trade-unions. It praised the excellences and the practical results of free co-operation and so flattered Proudhon and Buchez; but it made a sympathetic reference also to co-operative production by means of State aid, and so flattered Lassalle and Blanc.

The conclusion that was drawn from all this, a conclusion in which even then every one was inclined to agree,

was that the proletariat of all countries were conscious of their international solidarity. In a few general and sentimental passages, which must have cost Marx no little effort to produce, the national differences are smoothed and their representatives are united by one common bond. The rules were prefaced by a series of "Considerations" which contained the essence of Marxian teaching, though there were one or two tactful admissions, such as, for example, the appeal to "truth, justice and morality." But everything was put diplomatically; there was no offensive obtrusion of any doctrines. It was possible to interpret all sorts of meanings into the text; it was all things to all men, and it did not give the impression of wanting to fetter any one. Only a word or two was said about the aims of the association, and its actual work indeed in the early years of its existence consisted chiefly in supporting strikes. That was one reason why it enjoyed a certain amount of popularity even outside labour circles.

Then Marx began systematically to carry out his plans, that is to say, he began to fire the International Workmen's Association with his spirit, and so tried to direct the Labour movement in the different countries. We may observe how at each Congress of the International Association—at Geneva in 1866, at Lausanne in 1867, at Brussels in 1868, at Basel in 1869—there showed itself a gradually strengthening influence of the Marxian spirit. The congress imperceptibly adopted the ideas of Marx without his ever having once appeared on the scene. It is instructive to observe (as showing the degree of development which the Social Movement had then reached) that the time had not yet arrived for the whole of the working classes of Europe to be steeped in the spirit of Marx. For as soon as the International Association showed signs of being Marxian to any degree, disagreements arose in all directions. First, the followers of Proudhon began to murmur; then the trade-unions, especially when Marx expressed his sympathy for the Rising of the Com-

mune in Paris; and finally the disciples of Lassalle were dissatisfied. 'At the end of the sixties, a great part of the opposition embodied itself in one man, whose name was Michael Bakunin. There are differences of opinion as to the extent which personal spite and personal quarrels influenced this opposition. It is possible, perhaps, that the split was due in large measure to personal jealousy. My own view is that it was a difference of principle that actuated Bakunin in his opposition to Marx. In 1868 Bakunin established the "International Alliance of Social Democracy"; the majority of the members were Spanish and Italian Socialists with a sprinkling of Frenchmen, and in this alliance the fundamental differences between the two leaders came to the surface. At bottom it was the opposition between Revolution on the one hand and Evolution on the other; between an idealistic conception of history and a realistic one. Bakunin based all his activity on the one idea of forcible revolution, on the thought that revolutions must be, because they can be, brought about. Marx held the diametrically opposite view that revolutions are the last step in an upward economic evolution, and must come naturally, just as the chicken breaks its way through the shell when it is fully developed.

The opposition of Bakunin destroyed the International Workmen's Association. In 1872 its centre was transferred to New York, obviously to avoid a formal winding up. But it was the beginning of the end. The association was discarded in 1876.

Although its life was but of brief duration, and although it was clear from the first that it was but a sickly organism, the "old" International Association was not without important influences on the development of the modern Social Movement, influences that ought not to be undervalued. In the first place, it was the first visible expression of the solidarity of proletarian interests in all lands. The union may have been faulty in form, but the fact remained that the proletarians of all lands *had* united;

that by combining they showed that the Social Movement in each country looked beyond its borders, and that the tendency of Capitalism towards Internationalism must of necessity find its sequel in the Internationalism of the proletarian movement. This fact could not now be set aside; it had come to stay. In the second place, it had for the first time brought together the leaders and the rank and file of the workers of all lands to take counsel in the common cause. The peculiarities of the Social Movement in one country thus became known to the representatives of other countries; the advantages of the different movements were discussed, and so sympathy was created for what before was strange and unknown. The first International Association thus helped to strengthen the tendency towards inner unity in the Social Movement in different lands.

But its special importance lies in the fact that it was the first agency for the propagation of Marxian teaching. The reports of the General Councils and the debates at numerous congresses were, in a way, courses of instruction in the Marxian conception of history and in Marxian politics. It is quite clear that all this must have had no small influence in directing Socialism along realistic lines. Especially when it is remembered that propaganda was not only by word but also by deed, deed in a special sense and in a way which the founders of the International Association, Karl Marx above all, had not intended.

The International Association carried the idea of rational, Utopian Socialism to an absurdity both by some of its actions, and finally by its whole existence. There can be no doubt that the policy of the Association abounded in actions which were the results of the pure revolutionary spirit. The most important and best known of these was its support of the rising of the Commune in Paris, which may be accounted for, as I have already pointed out above, by the view held by Marx, of the mission of a "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." That at once stamped the movement as Utopian. I do not know

whether Marx in his later years perceived that by his support of the rising he was himself in opposition to his own conception of the development of the 'Social Movement. But so much is certain: the failure of the Paris rising in 1871, and the consequent split in the International Association, were proof positive of the truth of all anti-revolutionary conceptions of history. Despite the very deep sympathy that was felt for the heroes of the Commune, the rising had a deterrent influence on the coming generation of the proletariat. The only workers who were then realists (and therefore Marxists) were the English workers. They had up to then taken part in the International Association with a good deal of zest, but after the Paris incident they turned their backs on the Association. The action of the Association had the effect of a thunderstorm: it cleared the air. It became more and more plain that the whole character of the Association was opposed to the Marxian spirit. I do not know whether Marx actually realized this; perhaps he did. It certainly looks like it, for very soon both his and Engels' interest in the International Association entirely disappeared.

What did the International Association become when the English trade-unions left it? Nothing more than a society of "conspirators," a union quite of the old type, a sort of revived Society of the Just. It was a mere handful of revolutionaries, without any following among the working classes, who could represent no organization of any kind, either economic or political, for the simple reason that no such organization existed anywhere. Something of that kind might suit Bakunin; it did not suit Marx. And so it was that the more the interests of Marx declined, the more Bakunin's interest grew. It was characteristic of Bakunin that he saw "the only power which should bring about the political and Social Future State" in the International Association, with its few hundred determined members, some of whom, like Krapotkin, still dream to-day that they are strong enough to

kindle the flame of Revolution throughout Europe. Bakunin quite logically regarded the International Association as a society for the propagation of the revolutionary idea, comparing it to the Freemason organization—the Bourgeois International Association.

Now it must be admitted that if the re-organization of society was to be effected by way of propaganda, and in case of need, by violent action, as Bakunin believed, the International would have been a splendid beginning. But if, on the other hand, the new conditions were expected as a natural, slow development, then the International Association was a little too previous, if not altogether useless. An international understanding between the proletariat of all lands could be effective only when the Social Movement in each country had found its legs, when there were political or trade-union or co-operative organizations which might take counsel concerning a common policy. Before the proletariat could again of its own accord, and out of its inner consciousness, become aware of its international solidarity and of the similarity of the principal demands of its programme in all lands, it was necessary for the single movements to shed their national peculiarities up to a certain point, and for economic development to advance a stage further.

Not long after this actually came about. But Marx did not live to see it. His friend Engels, however, did, and on the 1st of May, 1890, he was able to exclaim: "To-day, as I write these lines, the proletariat of Europe and America is reviewing its forces, mobilized for the first time as a united army under one flag and for one purpose: the legal recognition of an eight hours' working day—already recommended at the Geneva Congress of the International Association in 1866, and again at the Paris Labour Congress in 1889. To-day's drama will bring conclusively to the notice of all the Capitalists and landlords in all countries that the proletarians of all lands are really united. If only Marx were by my side to see it all with his own eyes!" It is true that what seemed

to Engels so encouraging as a sign of life in the International—the celebration of the 1st of May—has proved somewhat disappointing. With the exception of a few states in the American Union where Labour Day is a legally recognized holiday, the institution has met with more and more opposition every year. Perhaps, after all, it is a little Utopian. The idea of making progress by means of propaganda on a large scale is surely an idea taken from the lumber-room of the pre-Marxian period. Certainly an increasing number of Socialists think so.

Since then the Social Movement has adopted the most modern and practical methods for giving expression to its international aspect. I mean the International Socialist Congresses and interparliamentary secretariates on the one hand, and on the other, International Trade Union and Co-operative Congresses. The first of these was held in Paris in 1889; others followed, that of Brussels in 1891, of Zurich in 1893, of London in 1896, of Paris in 1900, of Amsterdam in 1904 and of Stuttgart in 1907.

The "new" International, as the modern expression of the international solidarity of the proletariat has been (not altogether very happily) called is, in spirit at any rate, directly connected with the "old" International. Speaking of the latter at the Paris Congress in 1889, William Liebknecht was able to say: "It is not dead; it has taken new shape in the mighty organizations of the workers of each country. It lives in us to-day. This Congress here is the work of the International Workmen's Association."

"It lives in us to-day;" that was the point where the continuity of the old association was clearly perceptible. For it was in part the same men who had stood at the head of the old International that now, aided by the respect which their work in the past, no less than their personality, won for them, were introducing the younger generation to the new forms—Liebknecht, De Paepe in Paris, Karl Bürkli, Hermann Greulich in Zurich, and other veterans embodied in themselves the unity of the

old and the new movements. And yet what a change has taken place in the short span of scarcely two decades! Even a cursory glance at the international relations of the proletariat of our own day shows the wide gulf which yawns between them and the old International.

The old International, as we saw, wanted to force upon the proletariat of the different countries the idea of international solidarity; it wanted to create national movements out of the International movement. But now the former are in existence, and it is from them that the idea of an international union proceeds. The old International was a branch cut from the tree; it had no roots, and so could not but die; the new International was a branch growing on a tree with its roots deep down in the earth, and so was destined to live. The call to unity which Marx gave could be carried out in two stages, one of which has been realized in our days. "Proletarians in all lands, unite." That ought to have been the first call; the second should have been made only when that was realized: "Proletarians, now that you are united in each land, unite in a common cause." As a matter of fact, all the existing international associations of the proletariat are but the unions of proletarian organizations in the several countries, whether the organizations be political, trade-union or co-operative.

This certainly holds good of almost all the organizations of the working classes in Europe, of all the Socialist parties and of almost all the trade-unions. The only bodies not represented at the International Labour Congresses are, beside several of the "old" English trade-unions, a few others in one or two countries, which have been formed on a denominational basis. By far the greater part of these mighty organizations of the proletariat to-day combines with the representatives of the Social Democratic parties, just in the same way as the Federation of Trade Unions and the Labour Party have official representatives at the International Congresses.

Moreover, the International covers a wider area to-day.

In 1869, in Basel, only "nine" nations were represented; in Stuttgart, in 1907, there were twenty-five. Accordingly the members of the early congresses were not very numerous. Thus the congresses of the old International generally had less than one hundred members (Geneva 60, Brussels 96, Basel 80); the new International congresses show a great improvement. The official representatives in 1889, at Paris, numbered 407; in 1891, at Brussels, 374; in 1893, at Zurich, 449; in 1896, at London, 748 (of whom 475 were English); in 1900, at Paris, 788 (of whom 473 were French); in 1904, at Amsterdam, 476; in 1907, at Stuttgart, 884.

Perhaps the figures of the delegates at the first Congress in Basel, in 1869, set side by side with those at the last Congress, in 1907, at Stuttgart will give a good idea as to the enormous change.

1. CONGRESS AT BASEL IN 1869.

America	1
England	6
France	27
Belgium	5
Germany	12
Austria	2
Switzerland	24
Italy	1
Spain	2
								—
								Total 80
								—

2. CONGRESS AT STUTTGART IN 1907.

Argentina	3
Australia	1
Austria	75
Belgium	27
Bohemia	41
Bulgaria	5
Denmark	17
Finland	2
France	78
Germany	289
Great Britain	123
Holland	9
Hungary	25
Italy	13
Japan	1

THE TENDENCY TO UNIFORMITY 189

Norway	8
Poland	30
Roumania	4
Russia (social democrats)	39
„ (social revolutionaries)	24
Servia	1
South Africa	1
Spain	6
Sweden	19
Switzerland	21
United States	22
<hr/>	
Total	884
<hr/>	

But the new International differed from the old in its entirety, and not merely in its outward appearance. In the first place, the new International is not really international in the sense of the old Association, and that is why I said that its title was not altogether happily chosen. The old Association was an independent international society, and its members were either single individual workers, or organizations of workers in different lands. But to-day the organization of workers is on national lines; the single individual worker can be a member only of his national society, and these societies may combine into national federations. The national organizations send representatives to the International congresses. It is clear, therefore, that under the new conditions the latter have completely changed their character. Besides, the larger numbers attending lessens that feeling of intimacy and informality which was possible in the old International.

In the second place, the subjects of discussion are very different to-day. The congresses of the International Workmen's Associations were more or less like debating societies where, with much zeal and little understanding, questions of principle were discussed (partly from the point of view of the law of Nature); questions, for example, such as these: "Was it just to abolish private property in land, or the right of inheritance?" (Marx and Engels must have shuddered when they read the published reports of these congresses.) But at the "new" International

congresses only one question of principle was discussed, and that was forced upon the majority of the members in each case against their will by a small anarchist minority. Discussed at three or four congresses, the question was whether Socialists should take part in political action; with the result that the opponents of political action were expelled. Apart from this, principles have never been discussed, and the reason is that they are settled and fixed. We shall see further on in what sense this is meant. Only practical questions of the day are dealt with at the congresses of the new International. The old congresses tried to lay the foundations of the fabric of the Social Movement, the plan of which had been long made by the architect in London. The fabric has now been completed in accordance with that plan, and the object of the new International congresses is to extend it.

At the Congress in Paris, in 1900, an attempt was made to tighten the bond between different lands by establishing an International Socialist Bureau with its seat in Brussels. It was composed of from one to three (Germany has three) representatives of the socialist parties in twenty-five countries, and its object was to serve as Information Bureau, to establish a Socialist Library and Archive, to issue publications on important questions and on the progress of the Social Movement in different countries, to take such steps as should be necessary to help forward international action and organization on the part of the proletariat in various lands, and to make arrangements for the International Congresses which take place every three or four years. Since 1904 the Bureau is assisted by an inter-Parliamentary Socialist Committee. Great care was taken in defining the principles of its formation and its activity. The representatives of the different Parliamentary bodies in various countries were to form a committee who should elect an international secretary from amongst themselves. The secretary should put himself into communication with the secretaries of the

national parties in order to exchange views. In this way it was thought that uniformity of action could be brought about in the Parliaments of each country. Every country was to send two delegates to the International Parliamentary Committee, and the seat of the secretariate should for the present be in Holland. The meetings of the committee were to take place in the capitals of the larger States in turn. When circumstances made it necessary for adjoining countries, say France and Italy, to adopt a uniform policy with regard to certain matters, the international secretary was to call a conference for the purpose. "The International Bureau hopes that it will thus be possible to advance the interests of the International Proletariat still more than before, by means of uniform manifestoes, uniform motions, uniform action in the Parliaments of the different countries, and so eventually to bring about the realization of Socialist demands."

Side by side with the International Socialist Organization is the International Organization of Trade Unions. This, too, holds congresses from time to time, and to-day these form one of the strongest elements in the Social Movement. The first of them was, to my knowledge, the International Miners' Congress at Jolimont in 1890; the second was that of the International Textile Workers in Manchester in 1894. The great importance of these trade-union congresses lies in the fact that they unite all workers in the common cause, irrespective of their political faith. That is to say, they unite Socialists and non-Socialists on one platform. The international aspect of the trade-union movement has received still stronger expression in the international conferences of the secretaries of trade-unions, which form a kind of complement to the political conferences of the International Socialist Secretariate in Brussels. The conferences, which commenced in 1901, were at first summoned annually; now they are held biennially; and all the central trade-union organizations of the more important countries are represented. Current business of the conferences is attended

to by an International Secretary of the National Trade Union organizations, whose duty it is to keep in touch with the individual organizations, and especially to bring about co-operation when, in case of an important strike in any country, requests are made for assistance towards strike pay.

Most of the trade-unions have an organization similar to this. The following unions, for example, all have an International Secretary—the Miners', Sculptors', Bookbinders', Printers', Diamond Cutters', Clerks', Glove-makers', Wood workers', Hatters', Leather workers', Metal workers', Porcelain workers', Tailors', Masons', Bricklayers', Tobacco workers' and Joiners'. Two-thirds of these International secretariates have their seat in Germany. This is no mere accident. The working classes of Germany are as devoted to the idea of trade-unions as to that of Internationalism. Not so the workers of other countries. These, if they favour trade-unions, do not care as much for Internationalism; and if they care for Internationalism, they do not greatly favour trade-unions. I shall say more on this subject in the following section.

Now one thing is clear. The "new" International could not have been founded so easily if the economic and social development in modern civilized countries, and therefore the Social Movement, had not been pretty uniform. Contrariwise, the new International must have the effect of giving a uniform tendency to the development of the Social Movement in different countries.

We have thus reached the second part of the problem before us; we have now to answer the question whether, and in what way, there is a tendency to uniformity within the modern Social Movement. The next section deals with this, and following the general scheme of the book, we shall begin with a consideration of the tendency to uniformity in the socialist movement.

II. THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC POLICY

1. *Internationalism.*

Internationalism is the first idea which underlies the socialist movement to-day. We have already seen its outward form. It is now necessary to point out that this idea also shapes the inner life of the Social Movement. The wage-earners in all civilized countries, so far as they participate in the Social Movement, are filled by the same spirit of Internationalism. What is the nature of this spirit?

In the first place it is the expression of common interests. Thus, to take but one example, Pete Curran, in the name of the General Federation of English Trade Unions, greeted the members of the International Trade Union Conference with these words: "Internationalism is supported from the industrial standpoint, and no matter where the Conference might meet, its great aim is to show that when the struggle of the working classes is considered from the economic point of view, the same conditions are seen to prevail in all lands, whether they be monarchies or republics. Accordingly, when a question arises concerning the uniform interests of the working classes of various countries, no differences ought to be allowed to come between the workers of one country and those of another, neither differences of language, of political creeds, nor of national habits." His meaning was clear. Since Capitalism is the prevailing power in all modern civilized States, and since the proletariat is everywhere forced to oppose capital, it is only natural that the proletariat in different lands should support each other in the common struggle. They can do this by informing each other of their experiences; by presenting similar demands to different governments on questions affecting all workers alike (as is the case of Workmen's Compensation and Protection Acts); by mutual monetary help in case of

strikes, and by much more to the same effect. This particular aspect of Internationalism the proletarian movement has in common with many other movements, from the thousand and one scientific congresses to the International Labour Office in Basel and the International Agricultural Institute in Rome.

There is, however, something quite special about the Internationalism of the Labour movement. It does not appeal to the intellect alone; it also appeals to the heart. Socialists become enthusiastic about it because it stands for a noble idea, for the idea of the Brotherhood of Mankind. The visitor at a socialist congress cannot help feeling moved at the sight; it suggests to him millions of people taking hands. The official report of the proceedings at the Amsterdam Congress contains these words with reference to the opening session: "An impression of grandeur and power proceeded from this inaugural session which it is difficult to convey. The three presidential speeches undoubtedly stirred the minds and hearts of the delegates to the lofty conception of an International which, by the aid of science and through the solidarity of mankind, will assure eternal peace and human happiness." And yet only three speeches had been made—that of the Dutch President, Van Kol, and of the representatives of Russia and Japan. Genuine enthusiasm rings through the speeches at these congresses and breaks out into song. The favourite song is the French International, which ends—

" C'est la lutte finale
Marchons tous et demain
L'Internationale
Sera le genre humain."

There is a deep meaning in this singing in unison: it is the expression of the fact that even though the heads may now and again sway apart, the hearts after all beat in common. "See, how they love each other!" Ask the members of the "International Association for Labour Legislation," or of the "International Congress for

Economic Expansion," whether they can imagine themselves singing songs together, and you will have the difference between the proletarian and the bourgeois Internationalism as clear as daylight. The bourgeoisie sings only at national, the proletariat at international celebrations.

But it must not be overlooked that these songs do not, like Schiller's "Ode to Joy," ring out in the demand—

"Let wrath and vengeance be forgot, and our deadly foe forgiven."

The songs the proletariat sings are songs of war, full of wrath and vengeance against the State as it is to-day. In a word, proletarian Internationalism is anti-national (in a sense which I shall make clear in due course), and in this also is very different from the ordinary bourgeois Internationalism.

It is anti-national in that it is opposed to everything which comes under the head of Chauvinism, Jingoism and Imperialism—to all national expansion, to all national pride, to every attempt at making bad blood between nations, to any kind of colonial policy—and also to that which is regarded both as cause and effect of all these—to military systems and to war. The peoples ask for peace. The peoples have no antagonistic interests and no inimical feelings towards each other. There is, therefore, no reason for drawing swords. Every modern war is a senseless murdering of powerless millions who are led to the slaughter like so many sheep. The military systems are the soil where such criminal intentions take root and grow. This is the tone of the socialist congresses, and of the socialist Press, and it is heard even among the ranks of those Labour societies which have no political colouring. It is the same on both sides of the Vosges, on both sides of the Channel, on both sides of the Atlantic.

The Paris Congress in 1900 was opened by Jaurès—the man who received official praise for his courage at the hands of the German Imperial Government—with these words—

"In the name of the whole French Social Democracy and of the whole body of organized French working-men, I greet the organized foreign Socialists, and the proletarians of all lands. There never was a time like the present, when the need to give the workers uniformity of ideas and of action was so pressing. For, to-day Capitalism, to further its interests, appeals to the worst Chauvinist and bestial instincts (applause), and in all lands without exception it is seeking to maintain its position by stirring up old race prejudices, and by inciting one people against another. The most important question on our agenda, therefore, is the organization of international peace and of international brotherhood."

The speakers that followed gave their heartiest support to this opinion. Perhaps the most interesting speech was that of Pete Curran, the English trade-unionist, who said—

"The English delegates represent different organizations—trade-unions, as well as political organizations; but we all of us stand for international peace and solidarity, and we are determined to do all in our power to bring about the combination of all workers. We protest most emphatically against the rumour that English Socialists support the policy of the English Government. That is not the case. For we are all united in condemning English Imperialism and Jingoism and in branding the policy of robbery in South Africa."

The Congress then unanimously adopted a resolution to this effect—

"Bearing in mind the decisions of the International Socialist Congresses of 1889 at Paris, of 1891 at Brussels and of 1896 at London, which condemned militarism as one of the most dangerous results of the capitalist social order, and demanded that standing armies should be abolished, that international arbitration tribunals should be formed and that the people should have the final voice in questions of peace and war; bearing in mind also that the events which have occurred since the last International Congress have proved conclusively how much the achievements of the proletariat in the field of politics, no less than the general peaceful and normal development of society, have been endangered by militarism, more especially in its latest aspect as a world-wide policy; bearing in mind finally that this policy of expansion and colonial spoliation sets loose the demons of international jealousy and hatred (as was seen recently in the war against China), and that these threaten to make war a permanent danger, the economic, political and moral costs of which the proletariat alone will have to bear:

"The Congress declares—

"1. That it is necessary for the Labour party in each country to oppose militarism and colonial expansion with redoubled effort and increased energy.

"2. That it is absolutely necessary to reply to the alliance of the bourgeois classes and the governments for the perpetuation of war

THE TENDENCY TO UNIFORMITY 197

by an alliance of the proletarians of all lands for the perpetuation of peace—that is to say, to give up more or less platonic demonstrations of international solidarity and adopt energetic international action in the common struggle against militarism.

“The Congress suggests three practical courses for carrying this out—

“1. The socialist parties everywhere shall educate the rising generation to oppose militarism tooth and nail.

“2. Socialist members of Parliament shall always vote against any expenditure for the army, the navy, or colonial expeditions.

“3. The standing International Socialist Committee shall be instructed to organize uniform movements of protest against militarism in all countries at one and the same time, whenever there shall be occasion to do so.”

Or, to take another example. The Congress at Amsterdam in 1904 expressed its feelings with regard to the Russo-Japanese War in the following terms—

“Bearing in mind that agreement and common action on the part of the workers and Socialists of all lands is the surest safeguard for the peace of the world, this Congress, at a time when Czarism is endangered both by war and by revolution, offers a fraternal greeting to the proletarians of Russia and Japan who, because of the criminal conduct of Capitalism and of governments, are sacrificed to slaughter. The Congress calls upon Socialists and workers, the guardians of peace in all lands, to oppose the continuance of war with all their might.”

That this feeling against war is common to all Socialists may be seen in the fact that there are constant peaceful and fraternal greetings between the workers of one country and another. The working classes in England assured those in France that they did not wish for a conflict on account of Siam; the French working classes informed those in Germany that they did not harbour any feelings of revenge; the Russian workers told the Japanese that they detested the war between the two countries. But the feeling is shared by organizations of the proletariat which have no political aims as such. We have a good example in the report of the sixteenth International Miners' Congress, held at Lüttich in 1905. The question of peace and war was raised, and Thomas Burt, the well-known leader of the Northumberland miners, and formerly Under-Secretary of State in Gladstone's Cabinet, expressed himself as follows—

"There is no more important question for all classes and all nations than that of peace and war. Is it not remarkable that, after 2,000 years of Christian civilization, the Christian nations should still entertain the idea of destruction and annihilation? Unhappily, England does not by any means bear the least responsibility for this. I well recall the Crimean War and the war in South Africa. Every Englishman to-day is convinced that the first was a grave mistake, and as to the second, at least we had no hand in that, for all Labour members in Parliament, all trade-union and co-operative leaders throughout the land protested against such a criminal proceeding. I was recently over in South Africa and I was horrified at what I saw there. The English population have not escaped frightful misery, and an English soldier told me that he was now sorry he ever took part in the war, for he fought on the wrong side. The war had been directed only against the working classes. Humanity and justice were greater things than patriotism. It is only ignorance and prejudice that make war possible. And so we must try to replace these feelings by harmony and mutual respect."

Hu , a member of the Reichstag, who was specially greeted by the English deputies, spoke next—

"I regard this moment as of great importance, for we have heard an English politician, who has won respect by his splendid achievements, support the idea of peace. We on the Continent have gradually become accustomed to look upon England as the spirit of evil, ever ready to stir up the flames of war. But Germany also has recently done much to increase armaments. The great mass of the German people, however, looks upon such a policy with disfavour; it detests the war-cry heard in certain quarters. Every workers' parliament must of necessity be a parliament of peace. It is a mockery of Christian teaching when Christian preachers glorify fratricide from the pulpit. Christ would have driven such false disciples from the Temple. Who was it that was responsible for the removal of the chief instigator in France of the Morocco affair? The Social Democratic party. And that is always its policy; in the German Reichstag, in the English Parliament, in Belgium, in Austria, it raises its voice for peace. In Berlin itself, Jaur s wanted to use his wonderful powers of oratory on the side of peace, but the 'peace-loving' Government of a State which calls itself civilized, shut the door in his face. That shows where the idea of war is most at home; in no other than those circles who hope to derive material benefits from war. But we have no connection with them. The best patriot is not he who says: 'My country, right or wrong!' but rather he who puts justice above all else, justice to all classes and all nations. We are each one of us proud of our own country; we are none of us unpatriotic. But we do not want to hear the clang of swords; we want rather to hear all nations raising their voices in unison for peace."

Perry (America): "We, too, want peace. But so long as economic war continues it is impossible to hope for the prevalence of peace among the nations. The first step must be to abolish the privileges of those who have an interest in war."

Beugnet (France): "France—and Belgium—were the scenes of

some of the bloodiest wars in history. And we have been brought up with the idea of the 'natural foe.' On one side, the white cliffs of Dover and 'perfidious Albion'; on the other, the phantom of a German invasion. The capitalist class everywhere favours war, for in that it sees its only chance of defence against the growing power of the working classes. France was almost on the point of becoming as priest-ridden as Spain. But it freed itself by its recent ecclesiastical legislation. No sooner was this adopted than the Church began its intrigues to stir up war. The Pope coquetted with the Kaiser, schismatic though he is, and very soon there were rumours afloat that the Protestant Kaiser would come to France and re-establish Catholic power. But great as was the danger of France from the Kaiser, it was greater still from Capitalism. When Jaurès had been refused permission to hold his meeting in Berlin, the bourgeois Press turned and rent, not the German Government, but—Jaurès. Capitalism has its hold on the Kaiser and on the Republic and threatens the world with the worst foe of civilization—with war. And what would a successful war mean for France? It would probably bring a new Cæsar who would agree to a new Concordat, that would re-introduce the supremacy of the Church."

Other speakers expressed themselves in a similar strain. This Congress it was, too, that unanimously adopted a resolution expressing the warmest sympathy with the Russian workers in their struggle for freedom, and wishing them every possible success.

The means for opposing the evils of militarism were again discussed at the seventh International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart in 1907. It was a heated discussion, chiefly because the small minority led by Hervé demanded a more radical policy ever against war and militarism; they suggested the adoption of soldiers' strikes, of desertion, and of insubordination. To this the Congress was opposed, and eventually adopted the following resolution, which expresses the present view of international Socialism concerning the problems of war and militarism.

"The Congress re-asserts the resolution adopted by former international congresses against militarism and Imperialism, and declares afresh that the war against militarism must proceed hand in hand with the General Class War. Wars between nations are, as a rule, the consequences of their competition in the world market, for each State seeks not only to secure its existing markets, but also to conquer new ones. This means the subjugation of nations and lands and, therefore, spells war. But wars result furthermore from the continual attempts of all lands to outstrip their neighbours in military armaments—one of the chief supports of the capitalist class

supremacy, and therefore of the economic and political oppression of the proletariat. Wars are also favoured by national prejudices which the ruling classes fan into flame for their own interests, and in order to turn the attention of the proletariat away from the interests of their class and from the international consolidation of those interests. Wars, therefore, are part and parcel of the nature of Capitalism; they will cease only when the capitalist system declines, or when the sacrifices in men and money have become so great as a result of the increased magnitude of armaments that the people will rise in revolt against them and sweep Capitalism out of existence. The working classes, who contribute most of the soldiers and make the greatest material sacrifices, are, therefore, the natural opponents of war. Besides which, war is opposed to their highest aims—the creation of an economic order on a socialist basis, which shall express the solidarity of all nations.

“The Congress therefore regards it as a duty to impress on the working classes, and especially on their representatives in all parliaments, the absolute necessity of opposing all naval and military armaments and to refuse funds for their upkeep. They must remember the nature of modern society: that these armaments only help to continue the opposition of nations to each other. The proletariat must make it their business also to educate the children of the working classes in the spirit of international brotherhood and Socialism, and to strengthen their class consciousness. The Congress sees in the democratic organization of armies, as expressed in the so-called ‘citizen armies,’ in place of standing armies, a good guarantee against warlike attacks of one nation by another, and against the existence of national differences. The International is unable to prescribe one set mode of action to the working classes; this must of necessity be different in different lands, varying in time and place. But it is clearly its duty to encourage the working classes everywhere in their opposition to militarism. As a matter of fact, since the last International Congress at Brussels, the working classes have adopted various ways of fighting militarism by refusing grants for military and naval armaments and by striving to organize armies on democratic lines. They have been successful in preventing outbreaks of war, or in putting an end to existing wars, and they have utilized the uncertain state of society which war, or the rumour of war, produces to do something for the liberation of the working classes. We may mention the agreement entered into between the English and French trade-unions after the Fashoda incident, for the purpose of maintaining peace and for re-establishing friendly relations between England and France; the policy of the Social Democratic parties in the French and German Parliaments during the Morocco crisis, and the peaceful declarations which the Socialists in both countries sent each other; the common action of the Austrian and Italian Socialists, gathered at Trieste, with a view to avoiding a conflict between the two powers; the great efforts made by the Socialists of Sweden to prevent an attack on Norway; and lastly, the heroic sacrifices made by the socialist workers and peasants of Russia and Poland in the struggle against the war-demon let loose by the Czar, in their efforts to put an end to its ravages, and at the same time to utilize the crisis for the liberation of the country and its workers.

“All these efforts bear testimony to the growing power of the pro-

letariat and to its absolute determination to do all it can in order to maintain peace. The action of the working classes in this direction will be even more successful when public opinion is influenced to a greater degree than at present, and when the Labour parties in different lands are directed and instructed by the International. The Congress believes that if the proletariat is sufficiently energetic it will succeed in bringing about appeals to arbitration tribunals rather than to the sword, and will thus relieve nations of the burden which armaments impose upon them. The money and energy so saved might then be devoted to furthering the interests of civilization. If ever war threatens to break out, the working classes and their representatives in Parliament in the countries affected, should, with the assistance of the International Bureau, strive to take every step possible in order to avoid the occurrence of war. They must utilize every effort which, in their view, according to the political situation and the opposing class interests, will best contribute to the maintenance of peace. If, however, despite all efforts, war breaks out, then it becomes their primary duty to bring about its conclusion as quickly as possible, and thereafter to make the most of the opportunities offered by the economic and political crises which are sure to follow the war, in stirring up public opinion and hastening forward the abolition of capitalist class rule."

Whence does this anti-nationalism of the Social Democracy spring? Is it in any way due to a hatred of all that is national, of all that springs from the feeling of lifelong contact with the soil, of every "natural patriotism"? Is it akin to the hate for all that was natural, which filled the doctrinaire teachers of Cosmopolitanism about the middle of the nineteenth century, and which made it possible for Bakunin to write these words: "We are now convinced that from the point of view of the modern conscience, of humanity and of justice . . . patriotism is an evil thing, for it is the direct negation of the equality and solidarity of mankind. The social question, for a practical action to which the working classes of Europe and America are clamouring, can only be satisfactorily solved by the abolition of frontiers"?

I believe that there is no Socialist of any influence to-day whose thoughts and feelings are expressed by this passage. This will become more clear as we go along. But if this is so, are we to suppose that the anti-national sentiments to which we have called attention are due to the increasing indifference to all national traits? That is but the intellectual embodiment of Internationalism in

manners and customs? That it means, therefore, a general levelling down of all national contrasts? Or is it, perhaps, the intellectual expression of the fact that the proletariat was never filled with natural, patriotic sentiments? This, at any rate, appears to have been the view of Marx when he wrote the passage in his *Communist Manifesto*, which discusses the relations of the Communist to his country.

"The Communists have been reproached for wanting to do away with the idea of fatherland and of nationality. But the working classes have no fatherland, and what they do not possess cannot be taken from them. . . . The national peculiarities and contrasts disappear more and more with the development of the bourgeois class, with freedom of trade and the world market, with similarity of production and the consequent uniformity in modes of life."

There is no doubt that, whether consciously or not, the Internationalism of Social Democracy was founded upon this view for more than a decade. It is possible that there are to-day many Socialists who still hold the view expressed in the *Manifesto*. One can understand that. For what Marx says is very true. Every day sees the disappearance of special national characteristics, and thus becomes a further stage on the road to complete uniformity in all national traits, in so far as they affect thought, literature and art—in a word, all subjective and objective aspects of civilization. It is all due to the fact that nations meet each other more frequently, to the great facilities for travel, to the increasing ease in the transportation of idea by word of mouth, or by the printed and written word, or by pictures.

In the same way there is a sense in which it is correct to say that "the working classes have no fatherland." They have no fatherland in the physical sense; they have no feelings for the soil on which they live, as the peasants have. The proletarian is a product of our large cities, and he has neither roots in the soil nor any local characteristics. He is a child of the world. Nor has he a fatherland in the sense of his participating in a common civilization. There is little civilization in the depths where his life is spent; little of the material and little of the intel-

lectual benefits of civilization. His fatherland, it has been said, often lies six feet deep beneath the earth. Besides, there is little opportunity for a proletarian in his poverty to pay any regard to national dress or national food. And as to the national treasures of art and literature, they are, in the majority of cases, a sealed book to him.

As far as I can see, the particular kind of anti-national feeling which is anti-national out of spite may be found, for the most part, among the French proletariat, especially in the circles which are opposed to parliamentary action, among the purely trade-union Socialists, whom I have called Syndicalists. Recently, however, the old conception of nationality has been propagated in France by Hervé, whom we have already mentioned once before, and it is called Hervéism in consequence.

But I do not believe that the great body of Social Democrats would support the view expressed by Marx. That was proved conclusively by the Stuttgart Congress in 1907. The mass of Social Democrats, and especially their leaders, are to-day no longer international, because they have become national. The attempt of the proletariat to smooth away national differences has in no way weakened their national feeling, any more than that of the bourgeois class. On the contrary, the feeling, both with the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, has, if anything, been strengthened during the last generation. National consciousness has somehow developed, contrary to what might have been expected from actual conditions. Marx's opinion, "The working classes have no fatherland," is being replaced by another: "If that is so, let us give them one. Let us make it possible for them to participate in the blessings of civilization, so that they may be enabled to have a fatherland." The view is gaining ground among Socialists—indeed, especially among them—that all civilization has its roots in nationality, and that civilization can reach its highest development only on the basis of nationality. It is the recognition of this fact that makes Social-

ists so sympathetically inclined to oppressed peoples such as the Poles, the Ruthenians, the Armenians, and so forth.

This national feeling among Socialists is of the utmost importance, and, since it has so often been overlooked, I feel that I must lay stress on it. Perhaps the best way will be to quote the opinions of one or two leading Socialists on the subject. Fortunately there are two opinions of recent date, each expressed by a German Socialist famous for his anti-nationalism.

Edward David thus expressed himself a short while ago: "Those only who hold the view that national characteristics are of little moment will look with indifference on the decay of national feeling. They will even welcome such decay as being an onward step in the progress of development towards one homogeneous humanity, which knows no national differences. But Socialism, despite the universality of its aims, does not take up this position; and the proof may be seen in the protest of Socialists against the attempt to crush small nationalities out of existence. Wherever oppressed nations fight for the re-establishment of their political independence, whether it be the Poles, the Finns or the Armenians, whether in South Africa or in the Philippines, Socialists always express their sympathy with them. We attach no little importance to the individual life of nations in the development of human civilization; we would as soon wish to see that disappear as we should the individuality of any single person. For we believe that Socialism, just as its mission is to free the individual from the corruption and the oppression of the capitalist system, must also prepare the way for the real freedom and greatness of nations."

Engelbert Pernerstorfer expresses a similar view in splendid language—

"Nationality in its highest form is . . . a precious possession. It is the highest expression of human civilization in an individual form, and mankind is the richer for its appearance." The aim of the Socialists is to give the

proletariat an opportunity of participating in this civilization. "Our purpose is not only to see to it that men shall be housed and fed and clothed in a manner worthy of human beings, but also that they may become humanized by participation in the culture of centuries, that they may themselves possess culture and produce it. All culture is national. It takes its rise in some special people, and reaches its highest form in national character. . . . Socialism and the national idea are thus not opposed to each other; they rather supplement each other. Every attempt to weaken the national idea is an attempt to lessen the precious possessions of mankind. . . . Socialism wants to organize, and not disintegrate, humanity. But in the organisms of mankind, not individuals, but nations, are the tissues, and if the whole organism is to remain healthy, it is necessary for the tissues to be healthy. . . . The peoples, despite the changes they undergo, are everlasting, and they add to their own greatness by helping the world upward. And so we are at one and the same time good Socialists and good Germans."

We have thus reached a remarkable conclusion. We started out to discover the grounds for the anti-nationalism of Social Democracy, and have found a strongly-marked nationalism. How is this to be explained? Is Democracy anti-national, seeing that its feelings and its policy are international, or is it not? The answer is, Yes and No. In reality, the contrast before us is not that of nationalism and internationalism, but rather of nationalism and nationalism. I shall try to explain what I mean by referring to the views on nationality held by Socialists and their opponents respectively.

1. Social Democracy takes the word "nation" to mean a collection of individuals who are united by a common language and a common culture. The opponents of Social Democracy rather think of the States of to-day as produced (quite accidentally) by history. The former accordingly have in their minds a community held together by a common culture; the latter, one held together by common

citizenship. In the one case, it is a national and social whole, in the other it is artificial and political. It is true that the one may quite cover the other, but it need not do so. Great Britain includes English, Scotch and Irish people; France is certainly a cultural unit, but many Frenchmen live outside it; Germany to-day includes Poles and other nationalities; and as to Austria-Hungary, it is made up of many and differing cultural units. The same applies to Russia.

Now, Social Democracy recognizes the right of each nation (in the sense of a linguistic unit) to independent existence, and, therefore, it is opposed to those States which attempt to crush the different nationalities within them. In those cases, like Austria or Russia, where the unity of the State rests on a dynastic basis, it opposes them not only for the above-mentioned reason, but also because it is anti-dynastic in feeling.

2. Social Democracy is opposed to the war of States one against another. It resists war, which it regards as brutal; for war not only cruelly sheds human blood, but also arouses the wild, bestial instincts of man. But the opponents of Social Democracy look on war, if, indeed, not as a boon to mankind, at any rate as a necessary evil. Social Democrats hate war, because they are opposed to militarism and Imperialism, which to them seem to contain the seeds of war.

3. Social Democracy does not wish to see nationalism degenerate into Chauvinism, and believes that the recognition of nationality, and of its right to separate existence, does not necessarily mean contempt for other nationalities. "The Chauvinism of certain sections of people is so ugly that it is clearly a hindrance to the formation of a manly and noble national consciousness" (Pernerstorfer).

4. In view of all this, the patriotism of Social Democracy is something very different from that of the ruling classes. Theirs is an official, political, warlike kind of patriotism. It is official in that it is officially inspired and sanctioned—is a kind of State patriotism. It is political

in that it is limited to the accidental unit recognized by the law of nations. Thus in Holland and Belgium, until 1830, a Netherland patriotism ruled supreme; since then we have Dutch patriotism in Holland, and a Belgian in Belgium. In Italy and in Germany, before each of them was united, every petty State had its own patriotic spirit; now a common patriotism prevails in each country. Austria-Hungary has a common patriotism at present, but whether it will always remain so is somewhat doubtful. In Norway and Sweden, as long as they were united, the spirit of patriotism was Scandinavian; it is now Norwegian in Norway and Swedish in Sweden. Naturally, this political patriotism attaches great importance to events which contributed to bring about, or to maintain, the unity of the State—days on which separate countries were united into one State, anniversaries of battles, days important for the ruling dynasty, and so forth.

Social Democracy will have none of this kind of patriotism, chiefly because it is so intimately connected with the ruling classes. It will have no common celebrations with opponents, being unpatriotic only in this sense. There are many reasons why Social Democracy dislikes official, political patriotism. In the first place, it does not recognize, or, at any rate, does not attach much importance to, accidental, historical divisions called States. "The nations included in the Austrian Empire have little cause to be Austrian patriots, for Austria has betrayed them all alike" (Pernerstorfer). Again, in monarchies official patriotism has a dynastic aspect. Moreover, official patriotism lays much stress on victorious battles which Social Democracy, out of its hatred of all war, does not wish to commemorate. Thus it comes about that the proletariat in different States takes up a different position with regard to official and political patriotism. It is just as difficult for the Russian Socialists to celebrate the Czar's birthday, or for their German comrades to take special note of the anniversary of Sedan, as it is easy for the French Socialists to make holiday on the anniversary of the storming of the

Bastile, or for the Italian Socialists on that of the *Breccia di Roma*, or the American Socialists on Independence Day. Social Democracy professes what might be called a "culture" patriotism, and, in the case of the German Socialists, it may be said that their patriotism centres at Weimar rather than at Potsdam.¹

But, when all this has been considered, the question may arise: Is not the socialist conception of patriotism self-contradictory? If Socialism recognizes the right of nationalities to independent existence, and would like to see that existence continued, does it not follow that it must recognize in the State the guardians of nationalities; that it must, therefore, look upon the opposition of State to State as a necessary part of the scheme; that it must regard war, the expression of this opposition, as inevitable; that it must admit the necessity for armaments, which are but the preparations for defending the State?

There is no such contradiction in the consciousness of the Socialist. In the case of those States which are made up of more than one nationality, each with its own culture, he does not admit that there is a necessity for their existence, for they do nothing to advance the culture of their component nationalities; nay, they rather hinder its development. He sees nothing valuable in the great powers of modern times. To him they are but the embodiment of capitalist or dynastic interests. He believes that those national characteristics which are of value will thrive as well, if not better, in small, independent nationalities, as they do in great States. But, above all, the Socialist does not admit that there are national antipathies which can lead to war. When wars do come about it is because of capitalist or dynastic interests. Neither the one nor the other seem essential to the Socialist; he would replace Capitalism by Socialism, and dynastic rule by democracy. Accordingly, he cannot regard national, or rather State,

¹ Weimar is associated with Goethe and Schiller and German culture; Potsdam is a fortress near Berlin, associated with the past and present military exploits of the Hohenzollern.

antipathies as necessary or permanent; he looks upon them as temporary accompaniments of nationalism.

Whether all this is true does not concern us very much here. It would be impossible to prove it scientifically, because much of it is a matter of personal feeling and personal belief. Thus much, however, is admitted, that neither for material prosperity, nor for intellectual and spiritual progress, is it necessary to have great States. All the culture of Germany dates back to the time when it was made up of small States. Switzerland, Denmark and Belgium are just as wealthy in material goods as Russia, Austria or Germany. It is further admitted that most of the international conflicts of modern times were due to capitalist or dynastic interests. But while it is impossible to prove the assumption that war would disappear with the disappearance of Capitalism, we may be sure that, if wars did break out, the cause would not be so petty as it often was in the past.

Other questions, also, suggest themselves. Is it not conceivable that a people which increases to a greater extent than its neighbour will find it necessary to extend its food-supply? And if every spot on earth is already inhabited, must not this extension take place at the expense of another people? And would the "expansion" always be peaceful? These, however, are questions which do not vitally affect the politics of to-day.

But so much is certain. If Social Democracy is to remain true to itself, if it is to strive to realize its aims and sweep away the capitalist system, if it is to bring about a freer and nobler type of man, it must of necessity occupy the position it does ever against political patriotism. The least recognition of Imperialism, Militarism or Chauvinism would be fatal to its highest ideals. It would mean nothing else than the negation of Socialism. And so the combination of Imperialism and Socialism appears to me Utopian. "National Socialism" is a contradiction in terms (taking National, of course, in a jingo sense).

Another point of importance is the extent to which Social

Democracy would be prepared to make a concession to the prevailing system so far as home defence is concerned. Certainly the German Social Democrats make such a concession in their demand for a militia. They realize that the present enmities existing between different States are likely to continue for some time, and that no State ought to weaken its defences without some guarantee that its neighbour is doing likewise. In a word, German Social Democrats are beginning to see that the Socialist ideal will not be realized in the near future.

The German Socialists go further in this concession than those of any other land. It is interesting to note what Bebel said in the Reichstag on March 17, 1904, on this point—

"Gentlemen, you cannot enter upon any victorious war without us. (Hear! hear! from the Socialist benches.) If you win, you win with us, and not in spite of us. You can no longer manage without our help. (Hear! hear! from the Socialists.) I go even further. I say that in case of war, we have many interests at stake. . . . And if the war should be one in which we are attacked, one in which the existence of Germany would be endangered, I give you my word, every man-jack of us, even down to the oldest, would be ready to shoulder his rifle and march in the defence of Germany—not for your sakes, but for our own. (Hear! hear! from the Socialists.)

"That is our position, and we live and fight in order to make our Fatherland—perhaps ours more than yours (Hear! hear! from the Socialists)—a place in which it will be a joy to live, even for the least of us!

"That is our aim, and therefore we shall oppose with all our strength, and even to our last breath, any attempt to seize upon the smallest portion of German soil." (Hear! hear! from the Socialists.)

In a speech on December 10, 1904, Bebel referred to the previous speech, and expressed himself even more strongly—

"Do we demand universal military training as a jest? Oh no! It is because we hold that in face of possible dangers from without it is an absolute necessity for each man who can bear arms to be able to defend the freedom and independence of his country. You were amused when, in a speech of mine early this year, I hinted that if there was need, I myself, despite my age, should shoulder my gun and march in defence of our Fatherland. You were not sparing in your sarcasm. Well, I was very serious about it."

During the last few years sentiments of this kind have been often expressed by German Socialists, and it is on

that account that many French, Italian and Dutch Socialists have reproached them with being Chauvinistic.

2. *The Inner Political Programme.*

The principles underlying the inner policy of Social Democracy are pretty much the same in all lands. They have been often enunciated; perhaps the shortest expression of them that was passed, with a minority of one, at the Paris meeting of 1900. It was as follows—

“The modern proletariat is a necessary result of the capitalist organization of production. For the capitalist organization of production depends on having an object for exploitation, and it finds this in an enslaved working class, without economic or political independence. The liberation of this class can come about only in opposition to those who support the capitalist organization of production (which, by the way, from its own inherent characteristics, is tending towards the socialization of the instruments of production). Consequently there is but one course open to the proletariat, and that is, as a class to oppose the Capitalists. Social Democracy has taken upon itself the task of organizing the proletariat into an army ready for the social war, and it must therefore, above all else, ensure that the working classes become conscious of their class interests and of their strength. To this end it must adopt every possible measure, and advocate every possible reform. In particular, the Congress would suggest participation in political life, the demand for universal suffrage, the organization of the working classes in political, trade-union and co-operative groups, working men's education societies and so forth. The Congress calls upon Socialists in all countries to see to it that all these forms, at one and the same time education agencies and weapons for the fight, shall everywhere work together hand in hand. In this way, the power of the working classes will gradually grow, until eventually it will be enabled to deprive the middle classes of their economic and political influence, and to socialize the means of production.”

The fundamental points in this resolution may be thus briefly stated.

1. Modern Social Democracy holds a realistic and revolutionary view of history. Rationalism, Utopianism and Revolution are therefore given up.

2. The goal of the movement is the socialization of the instruments of production.

3. The means to that end is the class war. (“The liberation of the working class can be achieved by itself

alone.") This war, in accordance with the view of history expressed in the first paragraph, takes constitutional, and no longer revolutionary forms.

4. The Social Movement proceeds along three lines—political and parliamentary, trade-union and co-operative.

This programme, which clearly bears the Marxian stamp, is now pretty well accepted by Socialists in all lands. It gradually took shape and form at the International Congresses of the last ten or fifteen years. At the first four Congresses—in Paris (1889), in Brussels (1891), in Zurich (1893), and in London (1894)—there were still heated discussions on important parts of the programme. So far as I can make out, the two central points of the programme—the socialization of the instruments of production as the end, and class war as the means—did not lead to differences of opinion, as they did at the Congresses of the "old" International. But what did produce differences was the method of carrying on the class war. At all the four Congresses named, the Anarchists were represented as well as the Socialists, and they, under the leadership of Merlino and Domela Nieuwenhuis, objected most strongly to the participation of the proletariat in political, and more especially in parliamentary, activity. They were all for revolution; and only as a secondary means did they favour trade-unions and co-operative organizations. The conflict became violent and ended in the exclusion of Anarchists from participation in the International Socialist Congresses. Ever since the Zurich Congress, only those may take part in the Congresses who satisfy one of the following conditions—

1. "Representatives of all bodies that are striving to replace the capitalist order of private ownership and private production by social ownership and socialized production, and that look upon participation in legislation and parliamentary activity as necessary means to achieve that end.

2. "All trade-union organizations which, although they may not themselves take part in the political struggle, yet realize the necessity for that struggle. Anarchists are thus excluded."

The exclusion of Anarchists does not mean the weaken-

ing of the Social Movement by the departure of a goodly portion of its followers; it means only the loss of a few eccentric fellows. For, in reality, Anarchism in the last ten years, as we shall have occasion to see, has lost almost all importance. It is to-day a negligible quantity so far as the Labour movement is concerned. Even the Revolutionary Syndicalists in Romance countries do not regard themselves as Anarchists.

The conflict with the Anarchists was of value in more ways than one for the clear formulation of the Socialist programme. In the first place, it removed all doubt as to the necessity of parliamentary and political action, and this, I should add, existed to some extent in circles outside the Anarchists. To-day we may say that nearly all Socialists, with the exception, perhaps, of the Syndicalists in France, a number of Dutch, and a few Italian Socialists, agree that participation in parliamentary and political life is the first and most important duty of the proletariat. On the other hand, the conflict with the Anarchists has had no small influence in bringing home to the minds of those who advocated only political action the fact that other aspects of the Social Movement were also of value. This feeling has been strengthened by the wonderful growth of trade-unions and co-operation in all lands during the last ten or fifteen years, and the "pure politicians" among Socialists have thus changed their view with regard to this aspect of the Social Movement.

This was especially the case in Belgium, where trade-unionism and co-operation have been developed to a large extent, the latter, perhaps, even more than the former. And the Belgians are never tired of preaching the equal importance of these forms of the social war with that of political action. Moreover, the peculiar development of things in Belgium, in Denmark and elsewhere, has been of value in showing that there need be no opposition between the two aspects of the movement. That was something new. For in previous years such a view was prevalent not only in non-Socialist circles, but even among

Socialists themselves.¹ It was held that a purely socialist movement must of necessity be opposed to a trade-union and co-operative movement. Indeed, some non-Socialists believe that by encouraging the latter they will strike a blow at the former. That, at any rate, was one reason why certain Socialists were rather opposed to the trade-union and co-operative movements. But, of course, there is no such opposition between them and Socialism; the two forms rather supplement each other.

Thirty years ago, Frederick Albert Lange said some excellent things on this apparent contradiction between self-help and Socialism, and on the expectation that the former would endanger the latter. "It is very doubtful whether these achievements of the workers, hindered though they constantly are by the power of capital, may not in the end be a preparation for a thorough reorganization of social conditions and of private ownership. At any rate the opposition between this form of self-help and the help brought about by State action is not so great as is generally assumed." That hits the nail on the head. The truth of the view expressed in the passage has been abundantly proved by actual facts. The trade-unions and the co-operative societies take their place to-day as effective agencies in the general Social Movement. It has now been generally recognized that trade-unions, as typified by those in England, are but a preparation for the social organization of economic activities in the new order, and that in reality they are in total opposition to Capitalism. It has been recognized, too, that they do not in the least affect the Socialist character of the whole movement; nay, if anything, they rather strengthen that character.

Perhaps I should do well to add a word here against the shortsightedness of those who regard every regulation of wages as a form of social peace. One of the German trade-union organs had an excellent article recently on this subject. It considered what part the regulation of wages played in the class war, and asserted that the work-

¹ Cf. the view of Lassalle, p. 170.

ing classes quite admitted the blessings of wages regulation. But in so doing, they did not cease to work for their class interests; they did not give up their war against capitalist undertakers, or retire from the realization of their purpose of bringing about the supersession of Capitalism. In a word, they did not cease being Socialists. "The regulation of wages," the article goes on to say, "cannot be an act of peace for the trade-unions; it is only a stage forward in the class war, and it offers a new starting-point for further struggles." Or again, "there are different ways of regarding the regulation of wages. If the workers are conscious of the fact that they are a separate class with their own interests, which extend beyond the mere regulation of wages, and are opposed to capitalist exploitation, then they will regard wages regulation as a stepping-stone to better things. But if other motives than those of an onward struggle actuate the workers, if they allow themselves to be led by the idea of everlasting peace, then the regulation of wages is no longer a stage in the class war; it only serves the narrow, local craft interests."

This makes it pretty clear that it is possible for the trade-union movement (as indeed has been often the case) to be a stumbling-block in the way of the healthy development of the Socialist movement, but it need not necessarily be so. All depends on the spirit with which it is actuated. If that is socialistic, the trade-unions may be of the utmost service to the Social Movement. A new French writer—Halévy—who appears to have made himself thoroughly acquainted with the Social Movement, has thus expressed himself on the relation of trade-unionism to Socialism. "The trade-union is the preparatory school of Socialism. It brings to Socialism sane workers, and influences the Socialists in the direction of moderation. In other words, it makes them think, forces them to solve certain problems, and teaches them to see difficulties. The trade-union movement is one of the most deliberative of the movements of the working classes towards reform.

If it were abolished by some sudden stroke, the proletarian masses would find themselves forced to nurse the old dreams of the 'great day.'"

Within the proletariat, and among their leaders, the only differences of opinion that now prevail are those concerning the method of the class war. Some attach most importance to political and parliamentary action; others, while not actually hostile to this course, prefer to push on trade-union and co-operative organizations.

Now, it may be asked whether all this is not in direct opposition to the view taken up in this book, the view that a tendency to uniformity is showing itself among the Social Democratic parties. Moreover, are not voices heard from Dresden and Bologna, from Paris and Amsterdam, which speak of anything but peace and unity?

Certainly a superficial observer might be led to this conclusion. Judging from events in each country in recent years, and from reports of the International Congresses, he might believe that everywhere, but more especially in Germany, France and Italy, there are opposing elements which will never unite, and that the Socialist party will shortly break up into two irreconcilable groups—the Radicals, or Revolutionaries, on the one hand, and the Opportunists, Reformers, Revisionists, or even Ministerialists, on the other.

But I believe that a closer observation will show this view to be incorrect. I believe that the differences of opinion in the Socialist party to-day are over-estimated. To my mind, Socialists of all lands are really united on vital questions, and all Labour parties in reality follow the policy we have described.

There are, indeed, extremists amongst Socialists in all countries, whose one aim is "to make a revolution," who are true to the idea of old-fashioned revolutions as last exemplified in history by the Paris Commune. But they have nowhere very great influence, except, perhaps, in Russia, which, however, from the special circumstances

prevailing there, is a case apart. None of the "Radicals," neither Bebel, Ferri, Guesde, Hyndman, Adler, Lang, nor, indeed, any Socialist of importance who has a hold on the masses to any extent, is to-day other than a realistic, evolutionary Socialist—certainly in practice.

On the other hand, there may possibly be some among the Socialists who wish to make their peace with the bourgeoisie and with Capitalism; they are weary of the long class war. But, so far as I can see, they have little influence. All authoritative Revisionists, Opportunists, Reformers—men like Auer, David, Molkenbuhr, Vollmar, Heine, Kolb in Germany, men like Jaurès and Thomas, Vandervelde and Anselme, Turati and Knudsen, Van Kol and Pernerstorfer—all stand firm for the class war, and are revolutionary in the sense that they desire the total abolition of the capitalist system, and not merely its reformation. In fact, a man like Jaurès, with his peculiar temperament, is more in sympathy with old-fashioned revolutions than Victor Adler or even Bebel himself. At the Amsterdam Congress Jaurès fulminated against the German Social Democrats for their lack of revolutionary passion, and blamed them, forsooth, because, unlike the Frenchmen, they did not obtain the franchise in street fights!

Only when conscious of all this can we really understand the events which occur at almost every national Socialist Congress, and which are repeated on a larger scale at the International meetings. There is a heated discussion ranging over many days; then the two opposing parties frame resolutions to express their respective positions; these are put to the vote; often (as at Amsterdam) the voting is very close; one must, of course, be lost; whereupon the other is put and carried by an overwhelming majority. A good example is the fate of the anti-Revisionist resolution at Dresden. This resolution was lost there by 288 votes to 11, while at Amsterdam there were 25 national votes for, and 5 against it (12 not voting). This particular resolution expresses the fundamental view

of the Socialist parties on the question of tactics, and so I will quote it here in full.

"The Congress expresses its entire disapproval of the revisionist policy—that is, of the attempt to change our well-tried and successful policy of the class war by giving up all efforts to seize the political power out of the hands of our opponents and replace such tactics by compromising with them.

"The result of the revisionist tactics would be that the party which is striving for the speediest replacement of the existing system by one on Socialist lines, the party which, therefore, in the best sense of the term, is revolutionary, would become merely one for amending existing society.

"And therefore the Congress holds, in disagreement with the revisionists, that class opposition cannot be smoothed over, but that, on the contrary, it becomes constantly greater, and it declares—

1. "That the party declines all responsibility for the political and economic conditions which arise out of the capitalist system of production, and accordingly refuses to support any action which tends to keep the existing ruling class in power.

2. "That in accordance with the resolution of Kautsky at the International Socialist Congress in Paris in the year 1900, Social Democracy cannot exercise supreme power in society as at present constituted.

"The Congress further disapproves of any attempt to make light of class differences in order to smooth the way for union with the non-Socialist parties.

The Congress looks to the Social Democratic parties to use the influence which an increased membership and an increased number of votes gives them, to continue to spread information as to what is the aspiration of Social Democracy, and, in accordance with the principles of our programme, to push forward with all their might the interests of the working classes, to extend and to safeguard political freedom and equal rights everywhere, to oppose even more energetically than before the spirit of militarism, whether on land or on water, to oppose all colonial and imperial policy, and all injustice, oppression and exploitation in every form, and finally to extend social legislation in every direction and to make it possible for the working classes to fulfil their destiny in the political and the general life of the age."

Are there no disagreements, then, in the Socialist camp? Is it all peace and harmony? Scarcely. But the disagreements are not on fundamental questions. Socialists are pretty well agreed as to their goal, and as to the road which is to lead them there. If, therefore, there are differences, what are they about?

It is difficult to make this clear, especially to those who are outside the movement. To my mind, the differences among Socialists do not touch any one particular point.

They are rather more like cross-currents. And if we are to get a clear understanding of them, we must disentangle them.

There is no doubt that some of the differences spring from differences of view on political questions. There is agreement on the end and the means, but not on the marching speed. For while there are some who will make no terms with the existing order of society, who still regard it as the primary duty of Socialism to win and educate the masses in order to organize an effective fighting power, there are others who believe that the time has come for gradually winning a way into the organisms of the modern State in order to influence legislation and public life. The latter feel themselves sufficiently strong to be able to compromise with the foe without harm to themselves or their fundamental principles. The former, however, are afraid of all compromise lest their own principles should suffer. They do not feel themselves sufficiently strong for such a course. At the Amsterdam Congress Anseele expressed himself on this point as follows—

"You say 'direct or indirect participation in the work of government must lead to our giving up the class war and our great purpose, and must lose us the support of the working classes.' I don't agree. I have no such fear for the proletariat in countries where they are well organized. If in Belgium one fine day the party should decide to support the *Bloc*, or should even be fortunate enough to have a Socialist minister in the Cabinet, we should still be in close touch with the Labour party and our conscience would be at ease. . . . If only we were offered a position in the Cabinet, we should accept it and say 'Many thanks; when may we expect the next?' What? Shall our workers be influenced by the Church, shall they be brutalized by militarism, worked to death by long hours, weakened by poverty, helpless in old age, conquered in the struggle for existence, and when a bourgeois party suggests to us to amend all these evils on condition that we undertake to bear part of the responsibility of government, shall we say no? I for one should certainly not do so, and I am perfectly sure that if the proletariat of Belgium were sufficiently strong to create a situation like the one I have described, and I did say no, I should have my ears boxed and should be sent about my business. The Socialists of Russia, Bulgaria, Poland, Spain and Japan may decline the responsibilities of government with an easy conscience. It will be many a year before they are offered the chance."

This speech goes to show that the differences are not merely subjective, but that they are due to a large extent to the particular stage in the political and social development of the country. As Knudsen (Denmark) put it: "We should not take part in the work of government only to obtain power, but we should participate because we are ourselves sufficiently strong to do so."

Auer spoke to the same effect at Paris (1900)—

"All the questions which have excited and divided the French working classes, and forced upon us the necessity of listening to long discussions, have been already discussed in Germany, though perhaps not quite so passionately. Whether to join the non-Socialist parties, whether to take part in municipal government, are questions which we settled twenty years ago. We were forced by our experiences to do what our friends in France will have to do if they would not endanger the most vital interests of the working classes."

At the Paris Congress the supporters of each view were rather fierce in their attack on each other. It was all over the Millerand case.¹ And what was the result? Was there a split in the Congress? By no means. The party united on the famous resolution of Kautsky, in which the evolutionist standpoint was expressed, together with one or two vague sentiments concerning the appointment of Millerand. As Ferri expressed it in the course of the discussion: "The resolution certainly shuts the door on the recurrence of a case parallel to that of M. Millerand, but it opens a window for its entry." The resolution itself ran as follows—

"The proletariat in a modern democratic State cannot obtain political power accidentally. It can do so only when the long and difficult work of political and economic organization of the proletariat is at an end, when its physical and moral regeneration have been accomplished, and when more and more seats have been won in municipal and other legislative bodies.

"But where the government is centralized, political power cannot be obtained step by step. If an individual Socialist becomes a Cabinet minister, that cannot be regarded as a normal commencement of the seizure of political power by the proletariat. It must be looked upon only as a temporary makeshift.

"Whether in any particular set of circumstances such a makeshift ought to be adopted is a question not of principle but of tactics, on which the Congress can make no decision. But in any case this

¹ Cf. Appendix under 1899 (France).

dangerous experiment can be of use only if it is agreed upon by the party as a whole, and on the understanding that the Socialist Minister is, and remains, the representative of this party.

"Where the Socialist Minister becomes independent of his party, where he ceases to be its representative, his entry into the Cabinet becomes a means of weakening rather than of strengthening the proletariat; it tends, not to bring nearer the time when the proletariat shall have political power in its own hands, but rather to postpone it.

"The Congress lays it down that a Socialist is bound to resign from a Bourgeois Cabinet if the organized party declares that the Cabinet has in any way acted unfairly in the economic struggle between Capital and Labour."

This resolution was adopted by twenty-four national votes to nine (each "nation" has two votes). The opposition was made up of the two votes of Bulgaria (!) and Ireland (!), and one each of Poland, Russia, Italy, the United States, and, of course, France.

Side by side with these causes for differences of opinion, there are others. Above all, there is the fact that theoretic speculation is not in entire agreement with the facts of life. Life develops quickly, and in different directions, and very often the principles laid down in programmes do not keep pace with the speed, nor do they take the direction of this development. The consequence is that theory and practice are often at variance. Now there are people whose chief aim is to maintain purity of doctrine; they logically develop the traditional dogmas, paying no heed to the demands of the day. Such people attempt to make life square with their theory. But the more progressive spirits will have none of this. They know perfectly well that they will never reach their goal by acting in accordance with abstract principles; they realize that they must take changing conditions into account. These want freedom, while the others prefer the strait-jacket of systems. These want variety, the others plead for uniformity of tactics. And this applies equally to both the Radicals and the Revisionists. Men like Adler and Vandervelde will always be in opposition to people like Plechanow or Rosa Luxemburg.

Victor Adler holds "that it is difficult to decide questions

of tactics without being on the spot. For tactics depend on circumstances."

Rapin (Switzerland): "It is difficult enough to decide as to what tactics are best in the circumstances prevailing in one's own country. How much more for those of another!"

Vandervelde: "All members of the party in Belgium are agreed that international rules for tactics are useless."

Auer: "I voted for the resolution of Kautsky, not that I am ready to subscribe to every sentence, but because its general tendency, which is the all important thing, is one with which I am in agreement. ~~The~~ resolution has been criticized as being vague, as not covering the needs of every case. That is quite true. But, had it been otherwise, I should have voted against it. We do not want to have our hands tied for ever. We want to have freedom of movement within our programme. That is of supreme importance. We are not fanatics, prophets, or founders of a religion, who are able to say the last word on truth. We are seeking the truth, and therefore we must have liberty of movement."

On the other side is the view of Rosa Luxemburg: "What else can we do but set up rules for practical tactics? If we do not do this, of what importance are our Congresses and our international solidarity?" "The Dresden Resolution is not merely a piece of paper; it is an historic fact; it is a symbol."

These, then, are the two great causes for differences of view. There are a number of lesser ones such as different traditions, personal enmity, or personal friendship, and many others. All these cross currents bring it about that in real life there are not, as might be expected, two separate camps. Only at the Congresses do they appear, and the Radicals are in the ascendancy there. Not because they are Radicals, but rather because they include among their number those who know most about the theory of Socialism. These are strong in debate, and especially in drawing up resolutions, for they are masters in the art

of using the old terms, and in clear modes of expression. The others are not so well placed with regard to all this; they attach much less importance to words and formulas; indeed, very often they are unable to understand their meaning, because the new facts, which life and its development has brought into existence, are not yet matured enough to be classed into categories. They vote for the Radical expression of the Resolution only for the sake of peace, feeling all the time, no doubt, that the resolutions of Congresses have little direct influence on politics. This will account for the prevailing Radical majorities at the recent Socialist Congresses, majorities which condemned revisionist politics, whilst revisionist politics made more and more progress each day in every country. This progress is inevitable, for it is nothing else than the expression of the advance of Socialism. But the combination of radical resolutions and reformed practical politics proves that at bottom there are no real differences in the Socialist body.

The Socialist parties in different lands may be compared to an orchestra. They are all playing the same tune. But if there are differences, they are due to the different instruments of the players, from the big drum to the flute and the 'cello. Perhaps in some lands the members of the orchestra show a liking for big trumpets, such as those often used by military bands; in others they prefer stringed instruments. That is the only difference.

I shall now try and give a sketch of the Social Movement in the more important countries. The reader will then be able to judge for himself whether my contention that in every country there is a tendency to uniformity is correct. I shall start with the three principal types, and deal with them in the reverse order to that in the last chapter. I shall begin, therefore, with Germany.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

I. GERMANY

WE have already seen that the Social Movement in Germany has become embodied in a great political party --the Social Democracy. We must now add that the Social Democratic party is not the only one that represents the working classes. Even leaving out of account those portions of the proletariat who, because of their dependent position, are forced to vote for their Conservative or national-Liberal employers, there is still the Centre to be considered as a party which represents a considerable portion of the proletariat. But it is generally known that the clerical party owes its existence to historical accidents. And so the inclusion of a portion of the working classes in the party is a chapter in the history of political chance which does not really concern us here. We shall only remark that the Centre is already finding it difficult to satisfy the demands of its proletarian adherents, that these are beginning to leave the party here and there, and that everything depends on the party managers and on the Social Democracy as to when the proletariat will burst the bonds which bind them to the Centre, and join the Social Democrats. For this party in Germany represents the working classes as such; being the only organization in which political party and social class are identical. That is the reason why, in what follows, we shall limit ourselves entirely to it.

The Social Democratic party, which is the political organization of the proletariat, is to-day a recognized parliamentary party in Germany. It may be called, and it may call itself, revolutionary, because it desires to

replace the existing social order by a totally different one. Yet it stands on the basis of a realistic, evolutionary conception of history. In other words, this party strives to reach its goal by constitutional methods, having no intention of appealing to force; it attempts to achieve reforms that are practical, and thus to bring about the State of the future. It is, therefore, anti-revolutionary through and through. Of course, the present party, with its three million adherents, has not always been what it is to-day. In the early days there were certainly some among the members who, if they did not act like revolutionaries, spoke like them. But of that there is no trace now. This great body is anti-revolutionary, and evolutionary in its nature. Those who hold a different view must get their wisdom from the leaders in the *Neue Zeit*, or other journals of the same kind, in which Mehring and a few followers still wave the flag of revolution. But in responsible circles of the German Social Democracy there are no two opinions about these people. The party only smiles at their sallies and leaves it to non-socialist politicians to wax wrath with them.

I believe that on all important questions German Social Democrats are united, perhaps more so than the International Social Democracy, the unity of which I tried to show in a previous chapter. Indeed, so great is the unity of the German Social Democracy that when it is remembered that the party numbers over three million members, it is certainly remarkable. I have begun to realize more and more (I was of another opinion before) that the theoretic discussions about the principles underlying party tactics, about particular points in the party programme, in short, that all that has been written and spoken in Germany against "Revisionism," has no influence whatever on the practical policy of the party. The leaders hardly read the controversy of Bernstein and Kautsky; certainly the great masses do not; and those who do read them do so out of pure interest in the theory of the question. I do not believe that even one resolution of the

party is influenced by those theoretic disquisitions. Naturally, there are conflicts and differences of opinion within the party, but they are not 'due to different views on fundamentals, as expressed by the different theorists, and as, indeed, they exist in other lands, especially where the burning question is: Shall we participate in the work of government? 'Vollmar gave full expression to his view on this point at the party conference in Dresden. "It is certainly not the case that to-day we have to face more serious conflicts on questions of principle than previously." Or again, "I really cannot recall any case in the practical politics of the Reichstag where the so-called Revisionists were on one side and the Radicals on the other. They were always united. Bebel will confirm my assertion that, more than once, he and I were of one opinion, and voted solid either against one side or against another. That shows that 'Revisionism' is nothing but a bug-bear."

As I have already hinted, it is very remarkable that there are not more disagreements in so large a party, more especially when we remember that it includes a very large portion of the masses who are as yet politically unschooled. There are certainly many causes for differences of view. There is national temperament (cf. Bebel on the one hand and Heine on the other); geographical origin (cf. the bright, sunny south Germans and the stern, serious northerners); social position (cf. trade-union leaders and editors); differences in education (cf. a man like Vollmar with Hoffman); personal experiences; friendships and enmities, and a thousand other circumstances. Think of all these possible causes of difference, and yet the party remains united on all questions of importance. This proves how strongly it is bound together.

I believe, therefore, that the consummation 'hoped for by many a Liberal politician, that the Social Democratic party in Germany will shortly break up into a right and left wing, will never be realized. Nor do I believe that a change of leaders, when the old gang retire and the

newer men take their place, will make any appreciable difference in the character of the party. In any case, I regard one thing as highly improbable. I do not think the Social Democratic party, or even its right wing, will ever abandon its opposition to the non-Socialist parties. To do this would be to deal itself its own death-blow. So long as Capitalism remains, the Social Democratic party will cleave to the idea of class antagonism and class war. This is so self-evident to all those who have even a superficial acquaintance with the Social Movement that one is surprised to hear opinions to the contrary from important political observers. Auer was one of the most sensible and sober of the politicians in the Social Democratic party, but also one of the most respected among the Revisionists. What did he say on this point at Dresden? "You may think what you like of us, but if you imagine that I shall ever give up my class consciousness or betray my party to the bourgeois left, I tell you that is impossible; it is a wretched libel."

This view of the growth and essence of German Social Democracy which I ventured to put forward three years ago has been proved correct by recent developments.

Certainly in 1905 it seemed as if the flame of the Russian revolution would spread in Germany. Certainly many an enthusiastic comrade drew warmth, or even heat, from the flame and preached a new revolution by means of the General Strike. This revolutionary fever was at its height at the party conference in Jena (Autumn, 1905), where Bebel called up the spirits of the Russian martyrs, of the June revolution and of the Commune rising. But those who were at all acquainted with the real condition of things knew very well that it was but a passing frenzy, and that the great body of the party would have nothing to do with the revolutionary romance of Rosa Luxemburg, and people like her. The "bloody" 21st of January 1906 was from beginning to end a peaceful day. The idea of a general strike was knocked on the head at the Congress of the Trade Unionists in Cologne. Finally, at the party

conference in Mannheim (1906) it was agreed by an overwhelming majority that the party and the trade-unions were at one, and that—there was no contradiction between the resolutions of Jena and Cologne! Everything was again in perfect order, just as it was before the Russian revolution.

Perhaps the only result of the passing fever was that the Social Democratic movement was pushed a little more to the left, and its anti-bourgeois character became a little more marked in consequence. The elections of the spring of 1907 did the rest to force the party more in the direction indicated. For at the election bourgeoisie and proletariat violently opposed each other. The Social Democratic party carried off the honours. Not only did it maintain its number of voters intact; it actually added more than a quarter of a million to them. Moreover, the three and a quarter million socialist votes of 1907 were probably much more reliable than the three million of 1903. Accordingly there were inner and outer causes which contributed to the consolidation of the party, and to make it more united. If, on the one hand, all thoughts of revolution were cast aside, on the other hand, the party moved even further than before away from the bourgeoisie. One of the comrades of the extreme right, William Kolb, expressed himself after the elections to the effect that he regarded it as a bad policy, and dishonest to boot, to have played with the idea of revolution, but at the same time he wrote: "Not one of the Revisionists had the least intention of bridging over the differences which exist in society to-day, or, indeed, to turn Social Democracy into a bourgeois party." Everything then remained as it was and, as far as one can see, will long so continue.

In the Reichstag the Social Democratic party has 43 out of the 397 seats, and in eighteen of the States of the German Empire it had (1907) 135 representatives in the local parliaments. In addition to these there were

(1907) 4,996 Social Democratic members of municipal corporations.

All this shows hardly anything of the tendency towards international uniformity on the part of the German Socialists. In all that has been hitherto said of them it has appeared that they have retained and developed what is specifically German. Yet that other aspect has not been neglected. If we look at the trade-union and co-operative organizations, we shall see that this international spirit did not show up very well in its early days. It is different now. The speedy growth of these organizations in Germany is the great peculiarity of the Social Movement there during the last decade. Not only has the number of organized workers increased enormously during that period, and the financial strength of the organizations multiplied fiftyfold, but the value of this form of class war has been recognized; the spirit of trade unionism and co-operation is alive, and a generation of men and women is growing up who are devoted to the new forms, and are already developing them with a good deal of understanding.

The growth of this movement will be best shown by a few figures.

The number of organized workers in the so-called "free" (*i. e.* Social Democratic) trade-unions fourteen years ago (1895) was only 259,175. But there has been an enormous growth since then; especially since the year 1903, as may be seen by the following figures—

	Members	Increase on previous year	Increase per cent.
1902	733,206	55,696	8.2
1903	887,698	154,492	21.0
1904	1,052,108	164,410	18.5
1905	1,344,803	292,695	27.3
1906	1,689,709	344,906	25.6

In 1895 the federated trade-unions had funds to the extent of 1,640,437 Mk. (£82,021); now the figure has reached 25,312,634 Mk. (£1,265,631).

But what is of most importance is that the trade-union

organization has extended rapidly among non-socialist workers. These elements of the proletariat are more or less controlled by the bourgeois political parties, and the trade-unions serve an excellent purpose in that they keep their class consciousness alive among these elements. The "Christian" and "Liberal" trade-unions were, indeed, originally founded in order to maintain "social peace," and to smooth class differences. The pressure of circumstances, however, is too strong for them, and they are forced to adopt a proletarian war policy just like the "free" unions, or, indeed, any that deserve the name of trade-unions at all. It is in the trade-union that the German proletariat can give expression to its united will as a social class; it is in the trade-union (the different forms among them tend more and more to disappear) that the walls set up by political parties between the different groups of workers in Germany are broken down. In England, as we have already seen, the trade-union organization of the workers preceded their political organization; in Germany it was just the opposite way about. On that account the proletarian class consciousness among wage-earners in England was developed earlier than in Germany. But the German Labour movement has, during the last ten years, overtaken the movement in England, and to-day the movements in both countries are marching abreast.

The same applies to co-operation. At first German workers were opposed to this form of organization. German co-operation took the form of co-operative stores, and in early days was largely favoured by the lower middle classes. When, about the middle of the eighteen-seventies, the lower middle classes began to lose their importance, the development of the movement was checked. All this was changed the moment the working classes began to favour co-operation. That was at the end of the eighteen-eighties, and since then the movement has grown enormously. "As soon as the working classes began to participate in the co-operative movement,

their special interests and ideas, so very different from those of the lower middle classes, changed its whole character. In place of the narrow-minded conception of a co-operative store there appeared extensive schemes. . . . To spread a knowledge of the meaning of co-operation, a series of excellent propaganda campaigns took the place of personal recommendations in a small circle. Even the large towns were attacked. It was thought before that the large towns would be desert soil to the movement, since they could compete with it, as Schulze Delitzsch believed, both as regards low price and good quality in provisions. But the greatest achievement of all was the combination of the single co-operative societies into one big force. The attempt was made more and more to centralize wholesale buying by means of the Wholesale Societies, which were springing up everywhere, and also to increase independent production, especially in connection with the Co-operative Wholesale Society in Hamburg, which was founded in 1894, mostly by the working men's co-operative societies of Saxony. Ever since the foundation of this great co-operative society, Germany possesses an organized co-operative movement in which the working classes form the bulk of the members" (Riehn). The Wholesale Society did business in 1904 to the extent of thirty-four million marks (£1,700,000), in 1905 to the extent of thirty-nine millions (nearly £2,000,000), and in 1906 to the extent of forty-six and a half millions (£2,325,000).

To-day the working classes are the soul of the co-operative movement. This is proved by the fact that all the numerous new societies, of which often more than one hundred are registered in one year, are all started by working men. Moreover, the centre of the progressive co-operative movement is in Saxony, where the local societies are composed to the extent of some 70 to 80 per cent. of working-class members.

It is interesting to observe how the lower middle class spirit in the co-operative society is gradually abandoned

and a more proletarian spirit adopted. At the Congress of the Federation of Co-operative Societies in Kreuznach (1902) the central committee refused to admit one society which had among its rules the following: "In buying goods the society shall give preference to those businesses which admit the right of the employees to combine, and where trade-union hours are adopted." Thereupon a very large number of the societies, mostly of working men, left the General Federation and banded themselves into the "Central Federation of German Co-operative Societies." An important step forward was taken in 1904, when the Wholesale Co-operative Society decided to establish a factory of its own—a soap factory at Aken on the Elbe. At the end of 1906 the undertaking was still in the preparatory stage. The annual report of the thirteenth year of the Wholesale Society contains a special appendix on "the condition of the suggested soap factory," which concludes as follows: "There are enormous difficulties in the way of starting co-operative production. But we agree with our friends that the fight must be fought, cost what it may, and that we must spare no efforts to achieve our end." *Tantae molis erat, Romanam condere gentem.*

One or two figures show the growth of the co-operative movement in Germany during the last ten or fifteen years. In the early eighteen-nineties the membership of all the German co-operative societies numbered about a quarter of a million; to-day it is more than a million. But the takings in this period increased from 50 to 60 million marks ($2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 million £) to 250 million ($12\frac{1}{4}$ million £). The wage-earners and lesser officials form the membership of about one-half the co-operative societies, and in those which are included in the Central Fédération these elements form some eighty per cent. of the whole.

II. FRANCE

The mills of Capitalism grind exceedingly quickly. The characteristics of nations as we know them through the ages are suddenly changed in a few years. The development of the Social Movement in France is a striking example in proof of this. Pegasus yoked! The excitable, restless people whose political abilities appeared to be spent in setting in motion sudden acts of violence, who, as late as the year 1871, were in the throes of a delirious revolution, were forced by the stress of circumstance to enter along the great high road of the Social Movement and become a marching unit in the great proletarian army. It may be said to form the light cavalry in the vanguard of this army, beside the German infantry and the English heavy artillery. But the plan of campaign is the same for the light cavalry as for the rest. In plain language, the French proletariat is about to give up its Blanquist teaching, and is fighting the bourgeoisie by the same constitutional means as their comrades in Germany: in Parliament, in trade-unions, in co-operative societies.

In Parliament the Socialist parties have won recognition in a comparatively short space of time. Thanks to the peculiar relation which exists between parties in France, the Socialists have been successful, on more than one occasion, in appreciably influencing the trend of politics. In 1887, 47,000 socialist votes were recorded; in 1902 they had risen to 805,000; in 1906 to 896,000. There are fifty-two socialist Deputies among the 584, and their policy, as we may see in the daily press, is distinctly realistic and opportunist. And even if the so-called Millerandism¹ is impolitic (certainly the great majority of the French Socialists have expressed their disapproval of it), the very fact that it arose, and was discussed at great length, shows clearly enough the direction in which French Socialism is developing.

¹ Cf. p. 220.

The Socialist "Commune" is also tending more and more to be realized. Its form is not that of which the revolutionaries of 1871 dreamed, but the Socialists have won great power in the municipalities. In 1907 there were 149 mayors, 219 deputy mayors, and 2,160 municipal councillors in France who belonged to the Socialist party.

Nevertheless, French Socialists have not yet quite lost their factiousness—that desire to split up into numerous parties. But I have the feeling that this, too, is in process of decay. Have we not recently observed new attempts to organize the different Socialist parties into one whole? The agreements hitherto have not continued for long. But, at any rate, there is the will to agree. Besides, every new attempt to bring about peace cannot but bring the different groups a little nearer to each other.

It may with some justice be asserted that the Socialist parties in France are beginning to agree to bury their differences for ever and to form a great national party. The Paris Congress of 1899 seemed to be the nearest approach to this consummation. This was due to an overwhelming enthusiasm for unity, and ever since, every French Socialist carries about with him deep down in his heart, the wish for such a national party. Despite the squabbles of the P.S.F. (*Parti socialiste français*) and the P.S. de F. (*Parti socialiste de France*) during the last few years, an attempt was again made to bring about such a party in June 1905. It was said to be in consequence of the resolutions at the Amsterdam Congress that Jaurès interfered, after having dropped Millerand and his small following in the mean time. In January 1904 Millerand was excluded from the Seine Federation, and since then he has ceased to be a stone of stumbling. The idea of a national party could, therefore, once more take root, more especially as (in the words of Jean Longuet, one of the foremost members of the left wing of the P.S.F.) "time and circumstances had done their work. The separation into two united bodies would mean that the dissatisfied elements in each, while recognizing

their differences, would become conscious of the similarities in their own position and that of their comrades in the other camp." And so it came about that at the Rouen Congress (Easter 1905) peace was again made between the parties. This was due in no small degree to the policy of Jaurès, who took up a determined position on the side of the proletarian class standpoint. The *Socialiste*, which until then was the organ of the Guesdists, became the property and the organ of the whole party. The united party was called *Parti Socialiste, section française de l'Internationale ouvrière*.

Since then there have been small clouds on the horizon. But the unity of the Social Democratic party has continued. This is due largely to the yielding policy of Jaurès, who made concessions to the Left, which was once more increasing in strength. But there is danger to-day (1907) from another quarter. I mean Syndicalism, on which I shall say a word or two lower down.

If the yoke of the parliamentary party weighs heavily on the French working man, that of the trade-unions is still more difficult to bear. The histories of the French trade-unions are full of jeremiads concerning the incapacity of the French working classes to organize themselves, and what is worse, to remain in an organization, once it is established, and contribute regularly to its funds. An English trade-unionist once said at a congress of the "old" International: "When it is a question of voting for a resolution our French friends are ready to raise their hands; but if it is a case of having to put them into their pockets, they have a way of disappearing." That exactly describes the spirit which prevails among the working classes in Romance lands. There is a burst of enthusiasm, but its disappearance is as sudden as its rise. There is a lack of staying power. Another national evil which is detrimental to the formation of trade-unions is factiousness. Thus, in Paris alone, there are six trade-unions of jewellery makers, nine of lemonade vendors, twelve of bricklayers and stonemasons, nineteen of

painters, six of locksmiths, nine of train and omnibus servants, seventeen of printers, nine of bakers, and six of plumbers.

For all that, the pressure of circumstances is sufficiently strong to force even the French worker into the trade-union organization. The trade-union movement in France has grown during the last twenty years beyond all expectation. It started in 1884, when the unions were legally recognized. There were only sixty-eight unions then; in 1904 their number had grown to 4,227. In 1890 there were 139,692 working men organized in trade-unions; in 1906 there were 836,134. Considering the short interval, we must admit that this is progress indeed.

The French trade-unions have one special characteristic in that they have brought "Labour Exchanges" (*Bourses du travail*) to a high state of development. They are in reality trade-union centres. Originally founded as employment bureaus, they became the centres for all trade-union activity in any town. In 1907 there were over a hundred labour exchanges in France. All of them are united in the Federation of Labour Exchanges.

But now we must stay to ask an important question. I have been attempting to show that there is a tendency towards uniformity in the Social Movement. But is not the new Revolutionary Syndicalism, with its antipathy to parliamentary action, a serious check on this tendency?

We have already discussed the doctrines of Revolutionary Syndicalism from a purely theoretical point of view. Here we shall concern ourselves with noting what effect these doctrines have on actual life.

It must be at once admitted that Revolutionary Syndicalism plays no insignificant part in France to-day. The enthusiasm with which the new doctrines are set forth seems to be infectious, for they are discussed with great interest. So much is this the case that the leaders of opposite groups are forced to examine and re-examine

the ground of their own position and be ready to defend it at any moment.

But outwardly, too—in the representation of the General Labour Federation—the fact becomes more and more apparent that Syndicalism has taken hold of the masses. The executive of the federation is in the hands of Syndicalists, and it must be remembered that they have been elected by the constituent trade-unions.

But let us be quite clear about one thing. This hold of the Syndicalists on the masses has not had the result of raising the social faith of the masses to a higher level, or filled them with a desire for a higher form of social warfare. The syndicalist leaders are mistaken if they imagine that the masses understand the new teaching as they themselves do. The masses regard it as a revival of the old ideas of revolution, so dear to their hearts. There can be little doubt that in the adoption by the masses of syndicalist doctrines we may perceive the old dislike which the French spirit entertains of all progress, of the weary daily task in the parliamentary and trade-union struggle. No matter what the leaders of the movement may say to the contrary, Syndicalism has taken the place of antiquated Blanquism in the hearts of the impatient Frenchmen. It is, therefore, not a step forward, but a step back to old forms of social warfare.

It is, of course, exceedingly difficult exactly to ascertain the feelings and conceptions of the masses. But from the speeches and articles of the leaders of second and third rank, I get the very clear impression that the syndicalist ideas are being continually watered down, so much so that there is not much difference between them and Blanquism.

The "poetry" of the Social Movement often throws valuable light on popular feeling; the songs of the masses in their assemblies give a pretty clear expression of their sentiments. And so I shall quote two samples from the "war songs" which are being sung in France at present, and which are topically entitled "L'action

directe" and "La Grève générale." One thought, and only one, is the burden of both songs: Brothers, hope on, for very soon you will smash the old order with your strong fists and establish the kingdom of freedom and happiness on the ruins. The Fata Morgana of the "Great Day" appears once more.

Here are a few verses from the songs mentioned—

"L'ACTION DIRECTE."

"Serfs mornes de la glèbe,
Serfs tristes des cités,
Nous qui formons la plèbe,
La plèbe,
Debout, Les Revoltés !

Foin des lenteurs égales,
La force est dans nos bras,
Les actes sont des mâles,
Des mâles,
Les mots sont des castrats.

Armer de calme audace,
Prêts pour l'assaut final,
De la levée en masse,
En masse,
Donnons l'ardent signal.

Enfants, cueillez des roses
Pour en orner nos fronts,
Car on verra ces choses,
Ces choses,
Le jour où nous voudrons."

"La Grève générale" expresses similar sentiments. Its last verse runs thus—

"Debout, les gens aux bras nerveux
Plus d'humbles plaintes, d'humbles vœux,
Livrons bataille, et nous ferons
Plier l'Etat et les patrons :
Mettons-nous tous en grève . . .

It is the old story: unadulterated Blanquism !

The same pure Blanquism showed itself in the sympathy of the French workers for the vineyard labourers in their strike. Yet many Syndicalists looked upon it as the type of the real, the true Social Movement !

Now in so far as Revolutionary Syndicalism has taken root, it is certainly an element which disturbs the tendency

to uniformity. But I believe that the numerical strength of Syndicalism in France is over-estimated. It would seem that a determined revolutionary minority is terrorizing a strong majority inclined to reform. At any rate, the fact that the C.G.T. (*Confédération générale du Travail*) is run by Syndicalists does not in any way prove that the Syndicalists are in the majority in the separate trade-unions. For the executive of the C.G.T. is elected in a peculiar fashion. Every constituent union, whether large or small, has the same number of votes. Thus, a union of barbers' assistants in Paris with only forty members has as much influence as the Miners' Union, with no less than 110,000 members. In a general way it may be said that the biggest and oldest unions have reform tendencies, and that only at the head of the smaller and newer unions are the revolutionaries to be found. For example, the railway servants (50,000), printers (20,000), textile workers (25,000) are all anti-syndicalist. So, too, the majority of the miners; at their last congress (1907) 92,000 of them voted for arbitration tribunals (that is, in opposition to *action directe*) while 15,000 did not vote at all. For the mines to be taken over by the State, there were 87,317 votes; for them to be handed over to the workers—*i. e.* in accordance with syndicalist demands—only 17,000 voted.

But whether the executive power of the French trade-unions will soon be recaptured by the reformers, as they themselves hope, or whether, as the Syndicalists expect, Syndicalism will soon obtain entire mastery over the "played out," trade-unions, I cannot say. At the present moment no one can say with certainty what the development of events will be. *Qui vivera verra.*

One thing, however, deserves to be specially noted. The trade-union movement in France, whether it is reform or revolutionary, takes up a neutral attitude to religion, philosophy and politics, and strives to be wholly independent of the political parties. At the Trade-Union Congress at Amiens (1906) the question of the relationship

between the unions and the political parties was raised by the Textile Workers' Union, and there was a crushing majority, made up of both wings, in favour of neutrality—774 trade-unions voted in favour and only 37 against.

Co-operative societies are developing in France, too. It is a characteristic of the French working-man that he has a preference for co-operative production, a preference which dates back to the time of Buchez. Many circumstances contribute to nurse this preference. First of all there is the peculiarity of many French, and especially Parisian, industries that they are organized on a small scale; then, too, legislation is favourable (*e. g.* public bodies give preference to estimates from co-operative societies), and lastly, a number of foundations have been made in support of the movement (*e. g.* that of M. Benjamin Rampal, with a capital of 1,400,000 francs). In 1896 there were 202 co-operative production societies, in 1907 there were 362. But only very few working-men are members of these societies. The sturdier form of co-operation, the co-operative store, is developing much more quickly in France. According to statistics of the *Office du Travail* there were on the 1st of January 1907, 2,166 of these stores in France, of which 836 alone were bakeries. In 1906 there were 1,994; in 1903, 1,683; and in 1902, 1,641. The total number of members for 1907 was 641,549.

III. ENGLAND

If the tendency to uniformity which I perceive is to be fully carried out, an independent political Labour party with socialist ideals will have to arise in England. For all the other distinctive marks of the Social Movement are fully developed there. My opponents assert that the Social Movement in England will never bring about a Socialist and Labour political party. They go even further. They urge that as a proof that I am entirely

wrong in my view as to uniformity. It remains for me, therefore, to defend my position.

I admit that Socialism and the class war did not receive much encouragement in England. But we have already seen the cause of this. (England's economic position a monopoly, and the attitude of compromise of the bourgeois parties.) Now, if it can be shown that the cause is beginning to disappear, it must follow naturally that the Labour movement will develop along the same lines as on the Continent, where those special causes never existed. That would be, as I think, a fair assumption. But I might be met with two objections. (1) That the peculiar position of England will continue in the future, and (2) even if the position changes it need not necessarily develop in the direction I have indicated. In order, therefore, to fortify my position, I shall appeal to facts. What are the facts?

To obtain a clear view of the tendencies which are showing themselves in the English Labour movement, we must look at its history during the last generation or so.

Thirty years ago the English trade-unions were the strong fortresses of the Manchester school. They kept the flag of self-help flying, they were anxious to do everything by themselves, hated any manner of interference, and abhorred anything that looked like State Socialism. Their confession of faith was wholly capitalistic. They were born of the capitalist spirit; they wanted to live in the capitalist economic organization of society, and, if necessary, they were prepared to die in it. If profits rose, they expected a share; if they fell, they were ready to suffer with the capitalist employer. That surely is what a sliding scale of wages means, if it means anything.

One need but turn over the pages of the trade-union literature of those days to see that the sentiments we have described were the prevailing ones. And the best observers agree with me. Lujo Brentano,¹ *e. g.* has conclusively

¹ Cf. note on p. 143.

shown that the trade-unions made all measures of State Socialism unnecessary. He warned Germany not to adopt the social insurance legislation when this was first discussed. He prophesied the disruption of Germany if it did so. "Instead of working against Social Democratic influences," he wrote in 1881, "the proposed re-organization of economic life is paving the way for them. It will all result in the destruction of political freedom and national morality, just as in the case of Socialism. The end, therefore, will be the same, and there will be no very great difference whether it is brought about by the Socialist policy of the Conservatives or by the policy of the Social Democrats themselves. In either case it will mean the undermining of civilization." Brentano was expressing only what he had learned from the English trade-union leaders. This was the standpoint of the comparatively few skilled workers, who at that time were practically the only members of the unions. They had found it useful to support Capitalism.

At the end of the eighteen-eighties came the great strikes of dock labourers. That was the first sign of the appearance of labourers from a lower social stratum and the genesis of the new unionism, no longer the type so favoured by the Manchester school. The masses came more and more to realize that they could not do everything by themselves, and that in order to bring about improvements in the lives of the wage-earners it would be necessary to call in the aid of the State. Ever since, trade-union policy has inclined towards State aid. At the congresses the old-fashioned trade-unions of the Manchester school were always out-voted, until they themselves reconsidered their position, and decided to throw in their lot with State Socialism. In the mean time the new left wing of the trade-union movement had gone a step further, and set up a purely socialist programme which the congresses adopted.

Here are a few stages in this development. In 1890 the Trade-Union Congress voted for a legal eight hours'

day, even for adult male workers. Soon after an agitation commenced for legal, obligatory insurance, and for old-age pensions, which is even more socialistic. At the last congress it was decided "to urge the Government to establish a national system enabling every one (!) at sixty to obtain a pension of five shillings a week from a fund raised by imperial taxation." This is Communism of the purest kind! During the miners' strikes in 1893 the socialist demand for "a living wage" was heard for the first time, and it meant that the capitalist principle of the sliding scale was gone for ever.

At the same time the trade-unions began to favour State ownership and municipal trading. If there was disagreement on these points it was only as to the extent of State and municipal activities. But in 1894 things had gone so far that the Trade-Union Congress at Norwich adopted a resolution in favour of the socialization of all the instruments of production. It was, indeed, correctly asserted that this was due to the peculiar constitution of the Congress that year. But similar resolutions have been moved at later congresses, and one may justifiably assert that the English trade-unions to-day are very sympathetically inclined to Collectivism, to say nothing of the remarkable development of municipalization in all directions in England, helped forward by the pressure of proletarian interests.

If to all this is added the fact that the great majority of the trade-unions favours the solution of the Agrarian Question on the lines laid down by Henry George, there does seem sufficient ground for the assertion that the tendency to Socialism is apparent among the English working classes of to-day.

Admitting all this, it may yet be asked whether the Social Movement in England may not have a character of its own? Whether the feelings of English working-men may not be different from those of working-men on the Continent, and remain peaceful and conciliatory? Whether the trade-unions may not continue their non-political

policy, and so make it possible for the two-party system to continue in England? In other words, has the English proletariat any intention of entering on the class war along the same lines as is done on the Continent? Has it any desire to form an Independent Labour party?

The answer to this last question is simple enough for any one who is acquainted with general English conditions. The English working-man cares nothing for "principles"; he is too much of an "inconsistent opportunist." He likes to be left in peace, he likes to eat his apple-pie undisturbed. So long as he can do that he has no very special interest in politics. But if anything should happen to rob him of his peace, he is quite ready to adopt any means, even that of political warfare, that are likely to give him back his peace and his apple-pie. This is a point worth bearing in mind.

Accordingly, there is no wide gulf between the English working-man and his Continental comrade, no inner dislike such as that which the carefully nurtured German and the German Social Democrat feel for each other. Indeed, again and again have the English Labour leaders said: "The German Social Democrats are quite right. If we had to live in Germany we should adopt the same policy." In the same way the delegates of the English trade-unions think it only right to take part in the International Socialist Congresses. All of which goes to show that the English working-man does not really desire a special policy of his own; he puts the weapon of the class war in the cupboard—so long as he feels satisfied. But when he meets with difficulties in his path, he is at once ready to take up arms. This has been proved when the trade-unions have had to face opposition either from the Government or other public bodies, from capitalist undertakers, or from public opinion. Thus, in the years 1867-71, the English trade-unions listened readily to the idea of the International Workmen's Association because legislation was not favourably disposed to their develop-

ment. But the Acts of 1871 and 1875, and the conciliatory attitude of the capitalist undertakers and the public, at large, rather tended to produce a rosy optimism which held that no independent political party would be necessary.

This did not continue. There was a change of feeling in England with regard to the trade-unions, and for the last decade or so they have had to face opposition. It would seem that the capitalist undertakers are agreed as to the necessity of "breaking the tyranny of the unions," while public opinion is beginning to be afraid of the increasing strength of the unions, and is in mortal dread lest their policy should affect English industry for the worse, and thus put it at a disadvantage in the market. If that actually came about, the result would be that England would lose her unique industrial and commercial position, and would be forced to bring her conditions of production into line with those of other countries. All these are very serious matters, and it may therefore be said that the feeling of opposition to the trade-unions is deeply rooted.

This is exemplified in the recent legal decisions in England, which have been showing a tendency to put difficulties in the way of trade-unions. The elasticity of English law makes it possible for the courts to give expression to tendencies of this sort. Mr. and Mrs. Webb, careful and reliable as they always are, say that the present legal position of the English trade-unions is 'very' no means satisfactory. During the last few years the law courts have considerably limited what had come to be regarded as the rights of trade-unions. Of course, no attempt was made to make any of the actions of the trade-unions criminal offences. But the capitalist undertakers have a much more effective weapon. The acts of trade-union officials have been questioned, and the persons aggrieved have carried cases into the civil courts and claimed damages. The judges have pronounced many things illegal which before, in case of strikes, were

regarded as right and proper. Thus it was declared illegal for any trade-union to publish a black-list of non-union firms and non-union workers. Even so peaceful an act as picketing, without the least intention of using force, has been declared liable to be proceeded against in a court of law, because it may be construed into "way-laying and shadowing," and is, therefore, a nuisance to the capitalist undertaker. But, as at present defined, the law goes even further and makes the trade-unions liable for damages for such actions as would be quite proper if an individual member did them. In all probability it is now illegal for a trade-union official to take steps which lead to the attempt to influence a capitalist undertaker unduly, and illegal for him to refuse to employ "black-legs," or to dismiss them. Any private member of the trade-unions may do these things, so long as it is a *bona fide* attempt on his part, and not done in collusion with another. It is illegal for a trade-union official to try and influence any firm not to supply goods to another, or not to use the raw material delivered by any particular capitalist undertaker. Here, again, an individual or a union of employers may do this. But if a union of workers should attempt such a thing, their "conspiracy" may be actionable. As yet, workers are allowed to strike, so long as they are not guilty of a breach of contract in so doing; but it is very doubtful whether they may not be proceeded against if the strike is due to other causes than those of improving their own position.

All this was not really serious for the trade-unions so long as it was the trade-union officials who, in each of the cases mentioned, were liable. The Taff Vale decision, however, entirely changed the situation. In all cases where previously the trade-union official was answerable, the union as a body corporate may now be made answerable. One result of this is that, according to the English law of agency, if any trade-union official is guilty of an action which makes him liable for damages,

whether it be done in the course of his ordinary duties, or whether it be outside the scope of his duties, and even if contrary to the rules of his union or in direct opposition to the orders of his executive committee, the trade-union is held responsible.

Finally, when a union is proceeded against for damages, the plaintiff may obtain an injunction from the Chancery Division of the High Court, forbidding the trade-union and its officials from proceeding in the course for which they are summoned. If this order should not be observed, the union may be punished for contempt of court.

The Act of December 21, 1906, removed a few of these hardships. But it still remains to be seen whether the Act will be beneficial. Possibly it has come too late to save the trade-unions. For their position has been weakened enormously. Keir Hardie has calculated that up to 1905 the trade-unions have had to pay more than a quarter of a million by way of damages to the capitalist undertakers. That means—and this is the reason for my dwelling on this point at some length—that the trade-unions have lost much of their strength as fighting unions. It is not, perhaps, too much to say that their activities have been practically nullified.

I do not know whether there is any connection between this and the fact that for the last few years English trade-unions have been at a standstill. From 1900 to 1901 the membership remained stable; from 1901 to 1904 it has sunk from 1,939,022 to 1,866,755, or nearly four per cent. This means, of course, that their incomes have not increased. The 100 largest unions have had the same income since 1897, and when it is remembered that the demands on them have increased, it is clear that the position is unsatisfactory. The depression in trade since the beginning of the century has increased the numbers of unemployed. In October 1899 there were 2·3 per cent. trade-unionists out of work; in 1900 the figure had risen to 3·3 per cent.; in 1901 it was 3·7 per cent.; in 1902, 5 per

cent. ; in 1903, 5·8 per cent. ; in 1904, 6·8 per cent. This means an increasing expenditure for the trade-unions in unemployment relief. The 100 largest unions expended on this head—

In 1899	£188,000
„ 1900	£263,000
„ 1901	£327,000
„ 1902	£424,000
„ 1903	£510,000
„ 1904	£648,100

Clearly this state of things must of necessity lessen the reputation of the trade-unions in the sight of the workers, and do much to bring home to them the necessity for political action.

Are there any signs of the truth of this conclusion? Are the English working classes about to form an independent political party? Will they take part in the class war as defined in this book? Is there any indication that they will join the great international, uniform movement of the proletariat? Judging from a series of facts which go to prove my contention, I have no hesitation in answering these questions in the distinct affirmative.

For over twenty years attempts have been in progress to educate the English workers up to an independent class policy. In 1881 the S.D.F. (Social Democratic Federation) was established by H. M. Hyndman. The federation was a purely Socialist party, modelled on those already existing on the Continent and filled with the Marxian spirit. It made no concessions to the “inconsistent opportunism” of the English workers, and for that reason had no influence whatever on the bulk of the English proletariat.

The trade depression of the eighteen-eighties, and the great strikes at the end of the century, aroused the English working-man for the first time to take an interest in politics. “New” trade-unions were established, with a more forward policy. In these years of unrest the I.L.P. (Independent Labour Party) came into existence (1893) under the leadership of the new unionists—Keir

Hardie, John Burns and Tom Mann. The tendency of the I.L.P. has been described by Keir Hardie in these words; "From the very beginning this party has tried to work in close association with the trade-unions. Instead of deriding and belittling the trade-union, the co-operative and the temperance movements, it took up a most sympathetic attitude to them. But at the same time it made it quite plain that those movements were useless as agencies for solving the social question. Moreover, the I.L.P., although it never made a secret of its socialist aims, saw from the very first that a Labour party, formed in opposition to the existing parties, even if it were not uncompromisingly socialistic, must eventually bring the English Labour movement into line with that on the Continent. The I.L.P. took part in the elections and elaborated methods of agitation which influenced thousands and thousands who before had never heard of Socialism. The writers and speakers of the party have always presented Socialism in a simple, popular fashion, so that it might be grasped by the crowd. They always kept far from dogmatic assertions, believing that the right place for these was the university lecture-room, and not the public meeting. In a word, the I.L.P. has engrafted Socialism on to English political life and thought, with the result that to-day Socialism is no longer an abstract idea in England, but is a living principle, actuating the municipalities, on which the I.L.P. has hundreds of representatives, and influencing the atmosphere even of Parliament itself."

These were certainly achievements of some importance, and whether they were due solely to the I.L.P. or whether other socialist organizations (*e. g.* the Fabian Society, founded in 1883) also contributed to bring them about, is not of any great consequence. The point of importance is, however, that the call of the I.L.P. to the proletariat to take political action remained unheeded for many years, and Labour members of Parliament were few in number. The years of prosperity during the eighteen-nineties were

not likely to improve matters in this respect. It was not until 1899 that a change manifested itself. So sudden and radical was this—though noiseless—that on the Continent little notice was taken of it. And yet, as I think, it was a fact of the utmost importance for the development of the Social Movement. England now has a great Independent Labour party which stands on the platform of class war, which aims at the realization of socialist teaching, and, what is of supreme importance, is associated with the bulk of the trade-unions.

I shall show very briefly how this came about.

At the Thirty-second Annual Conference of the Trade Unions in Plymouth (1899) there was a motion down in the name of the Socialist, J. H. Holmes, one of the leaders of the railway servants, to this effect: "That, in consideration of the decisions of former congresses, and also of the necessity to have better representation of the interests of the working classes in Parliament, the Congress instructs the parliamentary committee to call a conference of representatives of the trade-unions and socialist organizations, in order to discuss ways and means with a view to increasing the number of Labour representatives in Parliament." The resolution was carried by 546,000 votes against 434,000. Of course, the two great unions of miners and textile workers voted against it. The instruction in the resolution was carried out, and on the 27th of February, 1900, there was a conference in London at which representatives of the trade-unions and the socialist organizations took part—the co-operative societies did not accept the invitation to participate. At this Conference the L.R.C. (Labour Representation Committee) was founded. Its purpose should be to vitalize and extend the existing Independent Labour party.

The agitation was unexpectedly successful. In 1902, 356,500 members of trade-unions promised their support to the L.R.C.; in 1903 the numbers had risen to 861,150; in 1904 it was 969,800, together with 165 trade-unions

and 76 trade councils. In December 1903 the first co-operative society came in. That year there were fourteen Labour members in the House of Commons. For the next election, some 80 to 85 candidates were in readiness. As to municipal elections, the L.R.C. in 1904 had 255 candidates, of whom 95 were successful. This meant a gain of 56 seats and a loss of only four.

What was the spirit of the new organization? The men of the S.D.F., who first joined the L.R.C., were not in the least satisfied with it, and very soon left it. The organization was not sufficiently determined, not sufficiently radical, for their tastes. They reproached it for harbouring men who were only mild Liberals.

I do not think these reproaches were justifiable. When we bear in mind the peculiar characteristics of the Labour movement in England, even the most Radical Socialist will be forced to admit that the L.R.C. could not possibly have achieved more than it has done. True, there were one or two elections under the new *régime* which were contrary to the principle of an Independent Labour party. But the L.R.C. expressed its disapproval of them, and at the Bradford Conference (1904) it passed a vote of censure on Mr. Bell, one of the leaders of the railway servants, who was not inclined to accept the principle in its entirety. This Conference, too, decided that the fourteen representatives in Parliament should unite to form a Labour group in the House. At the Liverpool Conference (1905) socialist demands were incorporated in the programme, and a resolution was passed to make it possible for the S.D.F. to rejoin if they should so wish.

The anxiety of the *Times* and other journals that believe they see passing before their eyes in England a socialist triumph like those on the Continent, is not, to my mind, altogether groundless. Let us listen to the words of Keir Hardie that appeared in a German socialist paper: "In the name of the I.L.P. I greet all our German comrades in these columns, and would assure them that our Socialism and our political movements are as import-

ant as theirs. If our tactics and our technical terms are different, it is because in England the conditions are slightly different. But our aim is the same as theirs—the creation of a socialist State; and we join with them in the cry: ‘Proletarians of all lands, unite!’”

Of course, there may be a relapse. A period of prosperity may lessen the interest in Socialism among the English working classes, and the desire for special class politics may decline. But it would be a bold assumption to believe that the events of the last few years have been in vain. I cannot do so. ~~That~~ much, however, is certain. The view I put forward in 1896 (when the proofs in support were but slight) that the English Labour movement was showing a tendency to uniformity has been abundantly justified. To deny its truth is to deny actual facts. Indeed, the events of Autumn 1905 more than justified my view. For the parliamentary elections showed that, in the future, great numbers of the English working classes were determined to carry on an independent policy, thoroughly socialistic in its nature. The House of Commons now has a Labour party numbering thirty. There were no less than 530,643 votes recorded in favour of Labour candidates, of which 331,280 alone were for candidates of the L.R.C. (which, by the way, now calls itself the Labour party). Of this number 232,378 votes were given to declared Socialists. Other socialist candidates, *i. e.* not L.R.C. candidates, received 42,253 votes. Adding these to the previous figure, we get 274,631 socialist votes altogether.

Perhaps the following table will be useful.

	For declared Socialists	For other L.R.C. candidates	Total of L.R.C. & Socialists	Trade-union group	Total
Recorded votes	274,631	98,902	373,533	156,930	530,643
Percentage . .	51·8	18·6	70·4	29·6	100

There has also been an increase of socialist members in all local bodies. The S.D.F. in the years 1904-7 had captured 76 seats in municipal elections (though losing ten). The I.L.P., whose branches increased from 250 in 1904 to 600 in 1907, had only 300 representatives on local bodies in 1904. But in 1907 it had 845, distributed as follows—

County Councils . . .	33	Boards of Guardians . . .	241
Town Councils . . .	42	Parish Councils . . .	102
Urban Councils . . .	70	School Boards . . .	22
Rural Councils . . .	25	Elective Auditors. . .	20

I believe that the account of the Social Movement in England, France and Germany which I have given the reader will prove conclusively whose view it is that is "utterly wrong."¹ Facts speak for themselves, and I might take leave of my subject here. But I propose to cast a glance at the Social Movement in other lands in order to remove any doubt as to the correctness of my view. We shall see, when we discuss the Labour movement in America and Australia, what truth there is in the statement that in both countries the movement "has nothing in the least socialistic about it."

IV. AUSTRALIA

That the Australian colony should be taken to illustrate the assertion that the Social Movement is not everywhere socialistic passes my comprehension. For if Australia illustrates anything, it illustrates the exact opposite. It proves conclusively the truth of my thesis. The tendencies which are everywhere apparent in Europe may be met with in Australia, and the remarkable thing is that they have come about without the least attempt at socialist propaganda. That would rather go to prove that the tendencies in Europe are not due entirely to propagandist effort, but

¹ Cf. p. 175.

that they result naturally from the prevailing conditions. There is a good book (by Albert Métin) on the social development of Australia and New Zealand, called *Le Socialisme sans doctrines*. That describes the situation admirably. There are no socialist theories, and yet Socialism is in full bloom. "It is an interesting proof," say Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb, "of the truth of socialist theories that we find them carried out here in actual fact by men of practical experience, who are not professed Socialists themselves. It is just because the Ministers of New Zealand take their ~~task~~ seriously that they have given New Zealand an organization which has an increasingly collectivist character."

I can give the facts only very briefly.

Ever since the bloody strikes of 1890, the Australian colonies have an independent political Labour party, and the realization of socialist demands is part of its programme. Of the seventy-five seats in the Lower House the party had twenty-four, and in the Upper House it had fourteen out of thirty-six. In 1904 political events brought it about that the ministry was formed by the Labour party. But even without actually being in power, the Labour party in most of the Australian colonies determines the policy of the country.

What are the salient features in that policy?

The State ownership of all means of transport and of all industries is advocated. The railways are already in the hands of the State, and now the mines are about to be taken over also. Moreover, the State has taken over the work of life insurance, and the time approaches when it will do the same with fire insurance.

Where private industry continues, the capitalist undertakers are cribbed, cabined and confined in every direction. There is the eight hours' day, beside any number of other regulations, and in many industries there is a minimum wage. Where this is not regulated by the law, "free wages contract" is replaced by State arbitration boards. There are no more strikes, for the State regu-

lates all the conditions of employment, including the regulation of wages. The principle of the "right to work" is acknowledged. All persons over sixty-five with an income of less than £50 per annum receive a pension from the State. The agrarian policy is distinctly favourable to the idea of the land reformers.

These different points have not been adopted in all the colonies. It would take too long to go into details. Suffice it that the tendency in all of them is socialistic; certainly in those where the Labour party has made its influence felt.

The trade-unions are filled with the same spirit, and their policy is entirely political. But, of course, they do not play so important a part as in Europe, for their chief aim—to regulate the conditions of labour—is in Australia carried out by the State. It may be said that the development of the Social Movement in Australia (but only there) has reached such an advanced collectivist stage—the "socialist State" has become realized to such an extent—that the fighting organizations to bring this about are beginning to decay, or have never been fully developed. Still, trade-unions do exist, and in 1902 the first Congress of the Australian Federation was held in Sydney, where 250,000 workers were represented. The resolutions did not concern themselves much with principles; they only demanded the extension of the existing laws—such as the adoption by *all* the colonies of obligatory arbitration; further legislation to protect workmen, State ownership of mines, engine and carriage factories, and the like.

But when all is said, the development of the Social Movement in Australia must not be regarded as typical. The economic conditions are peculiar, and the population is not very large. I have called attention to Australia, however, only because labour conditions there have been used as an illustration to show how wrong my view is.

V. BELGIUM

If any one wishes to see living Socialism in Europe, if any one wishes to see how in all probability the Social Movement will develop in all European countries, I would strongly persuade him or her to go to Brussels, or Ghent, and visit the *Maison du Peuple* or the *Vooruit* under the guidance of one of the leaders of the Belgian Socialists—Vandervelde, Anseele, Bertrand, or any of the others. It will be a splendid object-lesson.

The movement in Belgium is important because all sides of it have been equally developed—the political, the trade-union, and, not least, the co-operative. Vandervelde makes no boast when he says of the Belgian Socialism that it has united these three tendencies to perfection. "Socialism in Belgium, standing as it does geographically at the meeting-point of the three great European civilizations, has taken over the characteristics of each of them. From England Belgian Socialists have learned self-help, and have copied the independent and free societies, chiefly in the form of co-operative societies. From Germany they have adopted the political tactics and the fundamental doctrines, which were expressed for the first time in the *Communist Manifesto*. From France they have taken their idealist tendencies, and the integral conception of Socialism, considered as a continuation of the revolutionary philosophy, and as a new religion, in continuation and consummation of Christianity."

What the Belgian Socialists have accomplished during the last twenty years is astounding. No doubt their success is to be explained by the fact that the movement in Belgium has been fortunate in having at its head men of wide outlook, of strength of will, of political insight and of organizing talent. Moreover, the fact that the country does not extend over a wide area has been of

service to them; they have also been helped by the non-existence in Belgium of the institutions which are necessary to support a big empire—a standing army, for example. The consequence is that popular feeling has been able to give expression to itself without hindrance. Take the great movement in favour of universal suffrage, which was so successful in Belgium, especially in 1893. This would have been almost impossible in Germany, with her well-trained army.

A glance at the development of the movement in Belgium will have to suffice. The Labour party was formed in 1885, and finally adopted its present programme, which is probably the most "modern" of Socialist programmes, in 1894. Based on realistic Socialism, it is full of the Marxian spirit, but does not drag the old Marxian evolutionary theory with it, as the German movement does. It shows that the movement is led by men who know their Marx, but at the same time are not blind to the demands of the times.

In 1894 the Socialists won their first great electoral victory. There were 300,000 votes cast in favour of their candidates (about one-sixth of the whole number of votes), and 28 seats fell to their lot. The past ten or fifteen years, however, have not brought additional successes. Indeed, in 1904 the socialist votes showed a slight decrease, while the number of socialist members was reduced by five. It is very probable, no doubt, that a large percentage of the Socialist votes in 1894 were really liberal and democratic. But when under the pressure of the Socialists, Liberalism became more radical, these votes were again cast for the Liberal party.

In 1906 the party won back two seats. The total number of votes in 1904-06 was 469,094, which was an increase of 6,000 on those of 1902-04.

Besides the 30 seats in the Chamber of Deputies the Socialists have also seven seats of the hundred in the Senate. Moreover, there are 91 socialist members of Provincial Councils and (1904) 650 of municipal corpora-

tions. The Socialists are represented in 193 municipal bodies, in 22 of which they are in the majority.

But the Belgian socialists, as we have already pointed out, do not attach the most importance to their political activities. Their aim is much more to educate the masses in trade-unions and co-operative societies. To judge of their success, therefore, we must look at their achievements in this direction.

As to trade-unions, the following figures show their growth—

At the end of 1889	there were	62,350	organized workers.
" "	1901	" "	73,291
" "	1902	" "	101,460
" "	1905	" "	148,483

We see here the same great increase during the last few years as in other lands. Of those who are organized, about two-thirds (94,151) belong to the Social Democratic party. The rest may be divided as follows: 17,814 belong to Catholic trade-unions (though a more reliable figure would be 20,055. The Catholic trade-unions have made much progress recently; they doubled their membership in two years: from 10,000 to 20,000), 31,303 belong to independent unions, and 1,684 to Liberal trade-unions.

Official statistics for the co-operative movement in 1906 give the following facts—

Number of societies	161
Number of families who participate	119,581
Sales amount to	31,174,552 francs
Value of land	12,091,299 "
Invested capital	1,655,062 "
Surplus	3,035,940 "

A most interesting characteristic of the Belgian movement are the institutions like the *Maison du Peuple* in Brussels, the *Vooruit* in Ghent, the *Worker* in Antwerp, the *Progrès* in Jolimont. They are huge centres (the first named is also a fine piece of architecture) for the political, trade-union, and co-operative organizations. They are a sort of trade-union club houses, combined with co-operative stores. *La Maison du Peuple* in Brussels had in 1885—

three years after its foundation—400 members, a turnover 36,000 francs and a surplus of 6,000 francs a year. Now it has 20,000 married members, the turnover is about 5,000,000 francs, of which 2,500,000 alone was for bread (which, by the way, it bakes itself), 680,000 francs for coal, a similar sum for clothing, about 280,000 for small ware; 250,000 francs for meat; 900,000 francs for milk and butter, and 150,000 francs for coffee. The members receive medical attendance and sick-relief gratis; and all the social organizations in Brussels—the trade-unions, the societies, the political leagues, the educational associations—have rooms in the co-operative buildings free of charge for meetings and classes, and also libraries.

The *Vooruit* at Ghent, though a little smaller, is organized in the same way. In 1881 it had 400 members and a turnover of 70,000 francs. In 1901 the number of members had risen to 7,000, and its turnover to 2,500,000 francs.

We see in all this the seeds of a new social order. Louis Bertrand is quite right. "If the socialist agitation in Belgium," he says, "has been very successful, it is due to the method which the Socialists have adopted. They have founded co-operative societies in all directions, and have combined with them such advantages as make for mutual help and solidarity."

VI. DENMARK.

The picture in Denmark is very similar to that in Belgium. There, too, Socialism has reached a high stage of development, and its three branches have all received a good deal of attention, thanks to the leadership of wise men like Knudsen and Borgbjerg.

There has been a political Labour party in Denmark for a long time; it has participated in political life for over thirty years. In 1890 it obtained enormous influence,

About the middle of the eighteen-eighties it had no more than 7,000 votes; in 1890 they increased to 17,232; in 1895 to 31,872; in 1903 to 53,479; in 1906 to 77,000. The first two Socialist members of the Folkthing were elected in 1884; now, since 1906, there are 24 (out of a total of 102). The following figures show the importance of the Social Democratic party in the Danish Parliament.

Party	Votes		Percentage		Seats	
	1903	1906	1903	1906	1903	1906
Government Left	122,000	91,000	50	31	71	55
Right	50,000	68,000	20	23	12	14
Moderates . . .	18,000	19,000	7	6	11	9
Radical Left . .	-	42,000	-	14	-	11
Social Democrats	55,000	77,000	23	26	16	24

The Social Democrats also have six seats in the Lands-thing, the upper chamber, out of a total of 66. There are 450 Social Democratic town councillors distributed among 50 towns; while there are 600 Socialists in the governing bodies of 120 villages.

Of the trade-unions (in 1907) 69 central unions, with 1,044 branches, as well as twelve local unions, belonged to the Federation of Trade Unions, which has a membership of 78,081 (as against 62,849 in 1903). There are few organizations outside the Federation; in 1903 there were 20 such, with a membership of 23,477. All the federated trade-unions work hand in hand with the party organization, the executive of which has two representatives of the Federation on it, and the party, in its turn, is represented on the executive of the Federation. Denmark had (1897) only 270,000 workers, but even so it is the land with the greatest percentage (nearly 40) of workers organized in trade-unions.

As to the co-operative movement, Denmark is, perhaps, more advanced than any other country save Belgium. There are about 2,000 co-operative societies; half of these are co-operative stores, having 150,000 members, and

a turnover equivalent to some ten million pounds. The Co-operative Wholesale Society includes almost all the co-operative stores, and in 1904 had a turnover of one and a quarter million pounds, and produced goods itself to the value of £90,000.

VII. HOLLAND.

The Social Movement in Holland was handicapped until the middle of the eighteen-nineties by having to overcome anarchist tendencies. It was no doubt due to the strong influence of Domela Nieuwenhuis that Anarchism, which refused to participate in political life, became so powerful a force in Holland. But events were too strong for it, and Nieuwenhuis was swept aside by them. In 1894 the Social Democratic Labour party was founded, on the basis of modern, realistic Socialism, and to-day it is led by such practical men as Troelstra and Van Kol.

In 1897 the party entered the political arena for the first time, receiving 13,025 votes in the elections. In 1901 the figure was 38,279, and in 1905 it was 65,743. The party now has seven seats in the Chamber, out of a total of one hundred, and there are some thirty socialist town Councillors.

Until recently anarchist influence was strong also in the trade-union movement. But in 1897 the unions shook it off. The members of the National Labour Secretariat, founded by Domela Nieuwenhuis, decreased from 17,000 to 5,000.

The great bulk of the organized workers of Holland are united in the *Nederlandsch Verbond van Vakverenigingen*, which was established on January 1, 1906. This Federation included (1907) eighteen national organizations, with a membership of 28,400. It is in close association with the Social Democratic party, and periodical conferences to decide political action are held at regular intervals.

between representatives of the trade-unions, the Social Democratic party, the Socialist group in parliament, and the central Socialist organ (*Het Volk*).

As in Belgium, the co-operative movement in Holland grew out of the Social Democratic movement, but not to the same extent. The greater part of the co-operative stores are combined in the *Nederlandsche Co-operatieveverbond*, which in 1905 cut itself off from the non-socialist society, *Eigen Hulp*. The new organization has a turnover of 1,500,000 florins, and contains no less than ninety societies.

VIII. ITALY.

Especially instructive is the development of the Social Movement in Italy. It began with the Congress in Genoa in 1892, at which men with all sorts of views were present—Socialists, Anarchists, followers of Mazzini, Republicans, representatives of semi-patriarchal workers' societies, and those of friendly societies. Into this chaos it was necessary to infuse the light of Socialism, or, better, Marxism. There were but two Marxists in Italy then—Antonio Labriola, the learned Professor of Philosophy, and Mrs. Anna Kuliscioff, the wife of Filippo Turati. The latter ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge which his wife gave him, and very soon he became the third Marxist. But Italy made up for the lack of Socialism at this time by imbibing Socialist teaching afterwards. This was due in large measure to the weekly of which Turati was the editor—*La Critica Sociale*. It did not take long before Italy was full of Marxists of all shades of opinion. Indeed, books on Marx are more numerous in Italy than anywhere else, with the exception of Germany.

The Turatis took the Labour movement in hand, and directed it very skilfully into the main stream of Socialism. That was no easy matter in Italy, where there were all

manner of lower middle class, radical and anarchist stumbling-blocks in the way.

But towards the end of the nineties, opposition began to show itself to the Turati party. It became gradually stronger, and threatened to split the socialist camp. The leader of this opposition was Enrico Ferri, well known as a criminal lawyer. At the Congress in Bologna (1904) the decisive battle was fought, and the followers of Turati were defeated by a small majority. Turati himself did not leave the party. Nevertheless, he was regarded as a renegade, and an official candidate was set up against him in Milan. He, however, carried the election.

What were the points at issue between the two groups? Was it the old revolutionary spirit that was in opposition? Or had the followers of Mazzini, or the Anarchists, united to attack Socialism? It was none of these. The revolt which Ferri led was carried on in the name of pure, unadulterated Marxism against the revisionist, or, as it is called in Italy, reformed, pseudo-Marxism. The first teacher of Marxian doctrine was looked upon as a heretic, because he had so thoroughly digested those doctrines himself that he could not see his way to participate in opportunist practical politics.

The picture was very much like that in Germany, only that the revolutionary talk was more fiery, in accordance with the character of the southerners. It is the same opposition as in Germany, the same big questions, or rather little questions; an opposition between men who are agreed on fundamental principles, who are working for the same goal, and who are anxious to use the same means in order to reach it. Only on the momentary policy of the day do they differ. The difference is between men of action and men of thought; between practical politicians and writers; between opportunists and doctrinaires—nothing more, and nothing less. The tendency of the Social Movement in Italy will be as much influenced by the Bologna resolutions as the German Movement by those at Dresden. The demands of life will

carry the day, despite the sheet of paper on which are written words a little more revolutionary than before. And the policy of the Socialist party will be in accord with those demands. For it is perfectly well known that Ferri, like Bebel, is a man who has sufficient common-sense to reckon with facts as they are. He is at bottom a Realistic Socialist. It was he who said, "Just because human society is a living organism, it cannot be changed by sudden acts of force. Those who imagine that to bring about a new social order it is necessary to commence a revolution, or to carry out some acts of violence in person, are therefore thoroughly mistaken. It is as though you should expect a boy or a youth to develop so quickly in one day, in some revolutionary fashion, as to become a man at once. Scientific Socialism, under the direct influence of Marxism, has disavowed the old methods of revolution, romantic though they seemed. Whenever they were adopted they proved an utter failure, and for that reason they are no longer feared by the ruling classes. . . . Marxian Socialism has made clear to the great proletarian army of sufferers that it possesses no magic formulas whereby to change the world at one stroke. It has only one message: Proletarians of all lands, unite! That is the first condition for bringing about a change. . . ." And yet Ferri, who in these words gives expression to the programme of "reform" Socialism, sets himself up in opposition to poor Turati, because he actually tries to carry out the programme! Vandervelde was right. "At bottom it was a disagreement only about words."

But be that as it may, what we are concerned to note is that the Social Democratic movement in Italy is spreading in all directions. It has the characteristic which differentiates it from the movement in other lands—a characteristic, by the way, which I foresaw in 1892, and published in an essay of mine—that it has seized upon the agricultural proletariat more than anywhere else. What Saxony is in Germany, that the *Punto nero*, round Mantua, is in

Italy—the stronghold of Socialism, and the district is a purely agricultural one. Social Democratic successes have by no means been unimportant. The number of socialist votes has increased from 26,000 in 1892, to 135,000 in 1897, 164,946 in 1900, 301,525 in 1904; while in each of the years named there were respectively 6, 16, 32, and 32 Socialist Members of Parliament. Moreover, there are about 100 municipalities in the hands of Socialists.

Heavy storms have passed over the party since I wrote these words. For a long time it almost seemed that the tendency to uniformity, which I have described, would be frustrated, and the party be broken up into small opposing factions. The crisis was reached on May 11, 1906, when the Socialist Members of the Italian Chamber all resigned. But that, too, was passed successfully; the only consequence it brought with it was the shedding of the extreme left wing—the Revolutionary Syndicalists under Arturo Labriola and Enrico Leone. At the Conference in Rome (September 7-10, 1906) the united "Reformers," assisted by the two "centre" parties, carried the day by 26,547 votes to 5,278 of the Syndicalists. Thereupon the Syndicalists at their first Congress in Ferrara (1907) decided to sever their connection with the Socialist party. But they form only a small minority—a fact which they themselves admit.

The trade-union movement in Italy has developed along lines which I foresaw in 1892. It has followed in the wake of the political movement. There are four different organizations: 1. The Union of Industrial Workers (*Federazione di operai dell' industria*); 2. The Union of Agricultural Labourers (*Federazione di lavoratori della terra*); 3. Chambers of labour (*Camere del lavoro*); and 4. The Catholic Unions (*Unioni professionali cattoliche*). The latter have been in existence for only a few years and are opposed to the other three (socialist) organizations. They numbered (1904) 85,410 members, 27,283 of whom hailed from Sicily. The first group had a membership in

1902 of 238,980, in 1903 of 205,362, and in 1904, 175,102; the third group of 270,376 in 1902, of 188,440 in 1903, and of 347,449 in 1904. There are no reliable figures for the second group. In 1907 the first group numbered 204,271 members against 178,333 in 1906, and the third group numbered 392,889 members against 298,446 in the previous year.

The co-operative movement is making great strides in Italy also.

Recently a new centre for trade-unions, co-operative societies and friendly societies was formed in the *Confederazione del Lavoro* at Turin. It is under socialist management, and will in all probability tend to bring still more uniformity into the Italian Social Movement.

IX. NORWAY.

Sparks of the modern Social Movement have also reached Norway, which is a purely agricultural country. Nevertheless Norway is being consumed by Capitalism, though as yet the disease has only a slight hold on it. Social Democracy and the trade-union movement are identical terms in Norway; the workers organized in trade-unions pay their subscriptions to the Social Democratic party as a matter of course. This was only to be expected, seeing that it was only recently that the country has had any industrial development.

Both movements have made considerable progress, as may be seen from the following table.

The number of votes recorded at the elections, for the Storting were—

In 1894		=	0.3%	of the whole
„ 1897		=	0.6%	„ „
„ 1900	7,013	=	3.2%	„ „
„ 1903	24,526	=	10.3%	„ „
„ 1906	45,000			

From 1903 to 1906 there were four Socialist members in the Storting; but there have been ten since 1906. At the

municipal elections in 1904 the Social Democrats secured 330 seats (against 147 in 1901), 23 (out of 84) in Christiania and 22 (out of 66) in Trondheim.

All the workers in Norway who are organized in trade-unions belong to the *Arbeidernes faglige landsorganisation i Norge*. Their numbers were—

In 1904	9,089
„ 1905	16,862
„ 1906	25,308

Of the last, there were 12,622 who belonged to the *Norsk Arbeidsmandsforbund*, and 6,183 to the Metal Workers' Union.

X. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Ever since 1888 the Labour movement in Austria has been of the modern kind. The Austrian Social Democrats have been exceedingly fortunate in their policy; so skilful was it, that they enjoy an importance in political life far greater than their numbers would warrant. Curiously enough, in the restless political world of Austria, the Socialist party is the one stable body. In fact, it is not too much to say that in the last years this party became the main support of the Austro-Hungarian State. The youthful vigour shown by Austria is due to the adoption of universal suffrage and election by ballot, and both these are the work of the Social Democrats. Not only did the party agitate and fight for the introduction of this reform; it also showed, at the Conference at Brünn in 1899, how the reform could be brought about, by an object-lesson in the art of combining the opposing national elements of Austria. It did this by adopting the "Programme for national autonomy." Moreover, the Austrian Social Democrats were the first to attempt to solve the question which more than any other demands solution in Austria—how to maintain the independence of the separate nationalities without infringing the rights of the others—and they were

signally successful. Austrian Social Democracy is a model of internationalism on a national basis.

The following table shows their successes at the first election (May 1907) held under the new franchise—

Groups	Votes	Members
Social Democrats	1,041,948	87
Christian Socialists	722,314	96
Czech Club	600,909	83
Ruthuanian Club	562,142	30
Polish Club	395,630	54
German Nationalists	292,703	47
	<hr/> 3,624,646	<hr/> 397

There were 119 other members, who were supported by smaller groups. The total number of votes, including those of such groups, was 4,599,168.

Of the 87 Social Democrats, 50 were Germans, 24 Czechs, 6 Poles, 5 Italians, and 2 Ruthuanians.

The trade-union movement in Austria has made giant strides during the last years. Here, too, it is in close association with the Social Democratic party. There are three great groups: one is purely trade-union, and in 1904 numbered 189,121 members in 2,274 unions (in 1902 there were 135,178 members); and the other two are not of any great importance. Together they had (1904) a membership of only 11,530. In 1896 the three organizations together did not have an income of a million kronen; in 1901, however, they had three and a half millions.

It is a remarkable fact that the Czech trade-union workers have increased tenfold in the last decade. The Prague Central Association had—

in the year	organized workers
1897	5,230
1898	8,284
1899	11,744*
1900	13,149
1901	13,820
1902	12,948
1903	15,188
1904	17,078
1905	25,790
1906	58,514

The increase in one year, 1905-06, is thus 100 per cent.

In Hungary the modern Social Movement is still in the restless and uncertain condition which accompanies the process of consolidation. The Social Democratic party has still to fight for existence against a brutal bourgeois government. It is noteworthy that here, as in Italy, the movement has the support of the agricultural proletariat. The Union of Agricultural Labourers numbered (1907) some 50,000 members in 600 groups.

But the industrial workers, also, have made good progress in the direction of organization, as may be seen from the following figures—

In 1902 there were	7,999	organized industrial workers,	or	2.39%	of the whole
„ 1903	„	15,270	„	„	3.65% „
„ 1904	„	41,138	„	„	9.84% „
„ 1905	„	53,169	„	„	12.72% „
„ 1906	„	71,173	„	„	15.07% „
„ 1907	„	129,332	„	„	30.94% „

XI. RUSSIA.

Thanks to the speedy progress of industry in Russia during the last decades, the proletarian movement has been growing apace, and, on the whole, it is socialistic in character. But the absolute government of the Russian Empire, to remove which the proletariat and the Liberal bourgeoisie have united, has created special conditions, and for this reason the proletarian movement in Russia has developed in a special direction. We cannot, therefore, compare it with the movements in other lands, and so I do not intend to say more about it here.

The revolution which has recently shaken the mighty Russian Empire is connected with the modern Social Movement only in a very loose way.

XII. SWEDEN.

Here the Social Movement has to contend with many difficulties. But, taking into consideration the prevailing

agricultural character of the country, its importance cannot, in any case, be very great. Stockholm and Malmö are almost the only centres of proletarian elements. Besides, political activity is narrowed by the peculiar electoral system of the country, based as it is on the Census. And yet the Social Democratic agitation is very much alive, and at the election in 1902 was able to register 10,000 votes and to obtain four seats. In 1905 the number of votes increased to 26,000 (out of a total of 213,000), and the party obtained thirteen seats, which were increased by two as a result of the bye-elections in 1906. The Social Democrats now have fifteen seats out of a total of 230. The new franchise, which was adopted in 1907, extends the number of voters from 300,000 to 1,000,000, and, as a result of this, the Socialist party expects to see the votes in its favour enormously increased, and its strength in Parliament added to.

We must not leave unmentioned that there are signs of the development of a revolutionary syndicalist movement in Sweden. Its followers call themselves "Young Socialists," and when the Executive Committee of the Social Democratic party, in 1906, proposed to exclude the leaders of the new movement, 20,000 votes were cast in favour, and 8,000 against the motion. Whether all these 8,000 votes belong to the syndicalist movement, it is, of course, impossible to say.

The trade-union movement in Sweden, which has been in existence since the early eighteen-eighties, has made great progress during the last years.

The Trade Union Federation included—

In 1900 22 central organizations of 741 Trade Unions and membership of 46,000			
" 1904 25	"	880	" " 47,000
" 1905 30	"	1,173	" " 81,693
" 1906 30	"	1,291	" " 86,635
" 1907 30	"	1,726	" " 144,395

"The whole of this movement is a fighting organization, and its political colour is wholly socialistic." Besides these socialist unions, there are others with a membership

between 50,000 and 55,000. The total number of organized workers in Sweden is probably about 200,000, and they are thus one of the best organized units in the labour movement.

XIII. SWITZERLAND.

If Socialism has taken root in Switzerland only recently, despite the fact that the country has reached a high state of industrial development, the reason is to be sought partly in the clashing of national interests, and partly, or perhaps chiefly, in the fact that the Constitution is Radical and Democratic. It was only slowly, as in the case of America, that the "sovereign people" began to realize that even the most Radical Democracy cannot do away with the evils which Capitalism imposes on the proletariat.

But they have realized it to-day. The Social Movement is making headway in Switzerland. The Swiss Social Democracy has been fortunate in its leaders. I am thinking of old Greulich, the last of the disciples of Fourier, who is a practical politician with a marvellous insight into things; of Scherer, the President of the International Union for the support of protective labour legislation; and of my old friend, Otto Lang. The party has a modern, realistic basis, and recognizes as much of the teaching of Marx as is possible under the peculiar conditions in Switzerland. Its programme, drawn up by Otto Lang, and adopted in 1904, is one of the best and most liberal.

The movement received its modern shape in 1888. Since then it has made rapid strides in its influence in Parliament. Only 2,800 votes were registered for the Socialists in 1884, but in 1890 the number had already grown to 20,000; eight years later it was 50,000; in 1902, 63,000; and in 1905, 70,000, giving the party two seats (out of 167) in the Central Parliament. But in Switzerland, with its decentralized and democratic organization, the influence of the Social Democratic party in the govern-

ing bodies of the cantons and the towns is more important than in the central government. And here we find that in each of the cantonal governments of Zurich, Basel, and St. Gall, the Social Democrats had (1904) seven seats. In the County Councils of seventeen Cantons there were 158 Social Democrats—39 in Zurich, 22 in Basel, 20 in Neuenburg, 16 in Bern, 10 in Schaffhausen, 9 in Solothurn, 8 in Waadtland, 7 in Geneva, 6 in Lucerne, 5 each in St. Gall and Zug, 3 each in Baselland and Thurgau, 1 each in Freiburg, Aargau and Graubünden. Six towns have 9 Social Democratic members of the executive among them—3 in Zurich, 2 in Winterthur, and 1 each in Bern, Biel, Geneva and Freiburg. In the town councils there are 136 members of the party. Altogether there are 311 Social Democrats in the different executive bodies, to say nothing of Social Democrats on the judicial bench. Otto Lang, who has been mentioned, is, for example, a judge in the supreme court.

The trade-union movement is closely associated with the political party, at any rate so far as the General Trade Union Federation is concerned. This had a membership (1907) of about 50,000. But there are a number of trade-unions with a membership of perhaps 30,000 outside this Federation. Recently, too, it appeared as though a Catholic trade-union were about to be formed.

Like the trade-unions, the co-operative societies have made good progress in Switzerland. The co-operative union has a membership of nearly 150,000 in 230 societies. Its turnover was (1906) ten million francs, while that of the individual societies was fifty-four millions.

XIV. UNITED STATES.

We have now been the round of all the States that have a capitalist basis (and therefore a proletarian and Socialist movement), and have arrived at the country which is

usually quoted as an example in proof of the assertion that Socialism and class war are not the necessary accompaniments of the Social Movement. There is some reason for this; for in America there is a "powerful Labour movement," which, it would seem, "has nothing in the least socialistic about it."¹ That is the first impression, but a closer acquaintance shows that it is not correct. Any one who studies the subject attentively, and who tries to see the real picture behind the phrases, will discover the same characteristics in the Social Movement in the United States as in European lands, and also in Australia. They may not be so well marked as elsewhere, but they are there. That is the conclusion I have come to as a result of my impressions in the country itself, and of my studies during the last few years. I shall deal a little more fully with the whole question.

Let us begin with the "powerful Labour movement" which actually does exist in the United States, in the trade-union organization.

There are over two million members of the unions. These are various combinations of the individual unions, by far the largest and most important of which is the American Federation of Labour. This is the backbone of the proletarian movement. In its report for 1906 it showed that there were over two million members in the affiliated unions. Only six years previously the number had been a little over half a million (548,321), and this shows how rapid has been the growth of trade-unions in America.

Of the financial position of these huge organizations of mushroom growth we do not know much. The most we can say is that everything seems to point to the conclusion that they are not as sound financially as the English trade-unions, and that even the German trade-unions have more internal strength. What, however, is certain is that they do not pay much attention to the friendly society aspect of the trade-unions; they are, above all

¹ Cf. p. 175.

else, fighting organizations, and they have recourse to the same kind of industrial conflicts, and adopt the same means of bringing about industrial peace, as those in Europe.

To say that this "powerful Labour movement" is content with the existing capitalist order would not be strictly in accord with facts. More than once, has it shown its socialist sympathies; more than once has it expressed its belief in class war.

But what I consider the important point—the beginning of the end—is that the American unions (in what follows, except where there is express mention to the contrary, I am always referring to those in the American Federation of Labour) have commenced a policy of political action. The history of the English trade-unions shows that when once a trade-union movement is actuated by the idea that it is bound to represent the special interests of the working classes, the seeds of class consciousness and of class war have been sown. The idea, which is a corollary of this, soon takes shape, viz. that those special interests can be represented only by an Independent Labour party. Finally, once such a party comes into existence, a Social Democratic programme is not far distant.

For the present, the American unions are content to try the indirect method of representation; they urge the candidates of the two great parties to support their policy.

And that policy, although not yet entirely socialistic, is, almost so. The A.F.L. has no independent programme of its own, but at a recent congress it adopted certain legislative demands, some of them (2 and 3 below) unanimously. The most important of them were—

1. A legally recognized eight hours' day.
2. Nationalization of tramways, water, gas and electric works.
3. Nationalization of telegraphs, telephones, railways and mines.

4. Abolition of private ownership in land, and its replacement by a right of occupation and use.

All this scarcely supports the statement that the American Labour movement "has nothing in the least socialistic about it."

For the present, it is true, the capitalist system is tolerated, but it is uncertain how long the toleration is likely to last. "The trade-union movement undertakes neither to maintain the present wages system nor to set it aside. What we demand is a constant improvement in the conditions of the wage-earners. If that is possible under the present wages system, well and good; if not, that system must be swept away." These are the words of John Mitchell, the leader of the miners, and they represent the view of a non-Socialist, Conservative trade-union. Very probably the majority of the organized workers share the view.

But there is a large socialist minority in the American Labour movement as a whole, and the A.F.L. is not free from it. At all its congresses the Socialists may be heard, and although their motions have hitherto been lost, their strength is steadily increasing. Moreover, we must bear in mind that beside the unions affiliated to the A.F.L., there are a number united in the American Labour Union that have declared their readiness to join a Social Democratic party. They are, for the most part, the unions of the West, with a membership close on 200,000. Finally, we must take into consideration the fact that a beginning has been made towards the establishment of a Social Democratic party, and during the last few years the party has been quickly growing. In 1901 the various groups which were tending in the direction of a party adopted a common programme, which might have been the work of Marx himself. The first members of the new party were German immigrants, but the number of native Americans, whether of German or other origin, is increasing. At the Congress at Indianapolis (1901), where the party was constituted, only 25 out of the 124 delegates

(i. e. about one-fifth) were of foreign birth. The party has been fairly successful at the elections. In 1894 only 30,000 Socialist votes were polled in the whole of the United States; even in 1898 there were only 98,000. But in 1902 the figure had risen to 223,903; in 1904 it became more than 450,000. Of these, 408,230 were registered for the Socialist party, the rest for the Socialist Labour party. These figures represent the minimum of Socialist workers in America.

In face of these facts, one can scarcely maintain that the movement has "nothing in the least socialistic about it." On the contrary, it has a distinctly socialist colouring. The only question is whether the colouring will become more marked, or whether it will disappear in the course of time. I believe that a close examination of the American movement will lead to the conclusion that its tendency is more and more towards Socialism and the class war.

It must be remembered that there were special causes in America for the slow growth of Socialism hitherto. These causes, however, are being weakened, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that with their disappearance all obstacles in the way of Socialism will be removed. What were those causes?

In the first place, there was the free, Radical, democratic constitution, which is not favourable to the growth of class consciousness. But it is becoming constantly less democratic. There is no need to assume, as many people in America do, that the Constitution, especially in the single State, will be changed in an anti-democratic direction through the influence of the bourgeois parties. It is sufficient when we observe that the Constitution is carried out by the executive authorities (who are coming more and more under the influence of the capitalist class) in such a way as to make democracy a mere sham. In the fierce struggle between Capitalism and Democracy the former is sure to have the upper hand.

More especially may this be seen in the difficulties which legislation and the courts of justice put in the way of the

trade-unions in order to prevent the complete accomplishment of their aims. The more powerful and concentrated Capital becomes, the more high-handed is its policy in this direction. The consequence is that the workers are beginning to see that trade-unions are inadequate as a means of safeguarding their interests. Already there is a bitter feeling of disappointment in the ranks of trade-union members.

In the second place, the economic position of the American labourer was, on an average, an excellent one. That was another reason for the fact that the American worker never thought of Socialism. But now this cause, too, is showing signs of disappearing. The satisfactory economic position was due partly to the fact that the gifts of Nature were plentiful, and partly to the exploitation of the agricultural population by those engaged in industry. But a constant drain must of necessity lessen the gifts of Nature, and the agricultural population will one day shake off the yoke which was weighing heavily upon them. Then matters will be changed considerably, and the time is not far off. Already there are changes for the worse in the labour market. Up to recent years, labour was paid for at a high rate in America, because it was comparatively scarce. But now the American worker is threatened with a very serious danger—the demand for labour is met by an overwhelming supply. On the one hand, immigration has brought cheap labour into the country; on the other hand, the southern States have developed, and so thrown negro labour on the market. The result of all this is a fall in wages, and it is clear that the fall must continue.

In the third place, the American worker was deterred from a specifically anti-capitalist policy by the fact that he was not forced into the position of a proletarian. There was so much land to be had that he was able to become an independent farmer. Whenever a period of depression set in, the "reserve army of industry" moved to the West, where there was room for them and to spare. This

departure eased the labour market and kept wages high; and, for those who sought their fortunes in this way, the proletarian feeling had no chance of showing itself.

Taking all these considerations into account, it seems pretty probable that Socialism will make rapid strides in America within the next few decades. Already the Social Movement is beginning to show the same tendencies as in Europe, and if those tendencies are as yet not strong, that is due to the special circumstances. But these are becoming less and less every day, and the result is as obvious as it is unavoidable.

CONCLUSION

LET us review the course we have traversed in these pages.

We saw that as a result of the Social and Economic Revolution brought about by Capitalism during the last hundred years or so, a spirit of unrest has filled the minds and hearts of many, and has found its expression in a desire for a new social order and for the liberation of mankind from the bonds of Capitalism. Socialist ideas came into existence. We saw how the proletariat, the class that was oppressed, accepted the ideas with open arms, and how the modern Social Movement then grew up.

It may be asked, have all the attempts at ameliorating the conditions of life ended merely in a great movement of the masses? Has it all resulted in a restless, continued, progressive motion, like some never-ending process? It would seem that our age is in reality characterized in this way; it would seem that Socialism is imitating Capitalism in its restlessness, only that in Socialism the ends are ideal and not material.

But I do not intend to follow up this train of thought. It would lead us too far afield. Perhaps I shall deal with this most important question as to the value of Socialism in the world's development on another occasion. Here I shall only make one or two remarks concerning the embodiment of Socialism, concerning the Social Movement, which we have already examined in its various aspects.

I believe that any one looking dispassionately at the movement must come to the conclusion that it was inevitable. Just as the mountain torrent after a rainstorm

must rush down from the highest peaks into the valley below, in accordance with nature's unchangeable laws, so, too, the Social Movement could not but march onward. It is a point of the utmost importance to recognize that the movement is one of those great historical processes that happen in the world; to recognize "that we are all in the midst of one of those powerful movements in the world's history that change human conditions and make their influence felt on States. To want to deny their influence is as absurd as it is foolish to try and combat them with powerless weapons" (Lorenz von Stein). There are still people who imagine that the Social Movement is the work of a few wicked agitators; or that in Germany Social Democracy was called into being by Bismarck's policy. Such views of necessity lead to the conclusion that there must be some magic formula, or a course of action of some kind, that will kill the movement. What a misconception! What ignorance of the real character of the Social Movement! I hope that my consideration of the subject has made it perfectly clear that the Social Movement was an historical necessity.

One would have thought that the recognition of the fact that the Social Movement is inevitable would have had some influence on the practical policy of the ruling classes of to-day. One would have expected them to perceive that force is unable to sweep away a movement which is brought about by the course of events in history; that if you dam a stream, it does not return to its source, but rather overflows its banks and devastates the country round. But this lesson seems not to have been learned yet. The measures adopted in some countries to prevent the people from participating in political life, the means taken to hinder the growth of the constitution along democratic lines, appear nothing less than ridiculous. The pressure of the steam is not lessened when you close up the ventilators!

But we shall have to recognize even more than that the movement was inevitable. We shall have to accustom

ourselves to the thought that the movement has taken the only form possible—that it could not be otherwise than socialistic in its tendencies, and that it could adopt no other means than the class war for their realization. To show this necessity was one of the objects of this book.

It is clear that attempts at the realization of socialist ends by means of the class war will continue to be made in the near future. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the civilization of the future will be shaped by it. We shall thus do well to consider class war a little more in detail, and to ask, What has it in store for us? What duties will it put upon us?

To begin with, we must get as clear a notion as possible of what is meant by class war. We have already spoken of it more than once in these pages; but it is so important that a repetition will perhaps be useful, especially as there are still people to be found in whose souls the word strikes terror. But even where the term is not quite so horrifying, it is still wrongly understood by very many.

Class war is not identical with civil war, as some people would imagine. It does not call up the picture of bloody street fights behind barricades; it has nothing to do with murderous attempts on life; it does not have recourse to dynamite or petroleum. Such a distorted view is probably the result of confusing political with social struggles. Political struggles need not necessarily become civil wars, though history has shown that they have done so in many cases, especially under absolute governments. But in countries with liberal or democratic constitutions civil war is not easily conceivable.

As a matter of fact, the class war has but little in common with political struggles. This is the case even when the latter adopt violent measures, as in Russia to-day. The political movement in Russia is only very loosely connected with the proletarian class war. It is engineered by a mixed multitude, and its aims are to bring about a constitution which all classes of society demand.

But the socialist movement of the proletariat is striving, as we have seen, for something very different. The movement desires a new social order, desires to replace Capitalism by Socialism. And this, we repeat, can expect nothing from violent political revolutions. Let us assume that all civilized countries had a democratic constitution like that of the United States or Switzerland. The proletariat would still have to carry out its programme, namely, to socialize the prevailing capitalist system. Every one must see that violent political action would be of little use. Class war must still remain. Stripped of all accretions, and looked at in its simplest form, it can mean in our own age nothing else but the attempt to safeguard the interests of the proletariat in politics and in economic and social life. Every election where the Socialists have a candidate, every co-operative society with the set purpose of helping the proletariat, every real trade-union is a form of the class war, no more and no less than when the landholding class support high duties on corn, or when a congress of skilled workers demands the institution of a certificate showing fitness, or when a chamber of commerce petitions for favourable stock-exchange legislation.

Once the old conception of the class war is given up, the belief that was current, that the proletariat are drilling their ranks for a great last blow, must also vanish. There is, of course, no such intention. There is no need for any last blow. The class war goes forward quietly, step by step. As a matter of fact, every effort at social reform or social amelioration is a stage further on the way to the goal. And if Social Democrats are somewhat suspicious of social reforms, it is due partly to their feeling that these are only patchwork which will hinder, rather than help forward, the progress of society towards Socialism; and partly to the belief that these reforms may so improve the position of the working classes that they will become satisfied and lose all desire for the class war. I hold that such an eventuality will never come about. The

working classes will never again be satisfied. The better off they are, the more will their demands grow. Such is the nature of the modern man!

But the opposition of Social Democrats to social reform is anything but wise. After all, war of whatever kind has some justification only when it improves the conditions of life in one way or another. But is it fair to sacrifice the well-being of the present generation for the sake of the happiness which it is dreamed will be the lot of future generations? Surely the present also has claims. To improve the lives of those of our own generation is surely as great a duty as that of preparing a better future. Every real improvement in the condition of the working classes is an end in itself. If one sorrow is lessened, and one tear dried, as good a piece of work is accomplished as building up the foundations of a future where there shall be no sorrow and no tears. The popular leaders must see to it that the living are helped; they must look at the present and not always be thinking only of the future. No one will deny that it is a fine thing to inspire the masses with enthusiasm; no one will deny that struggle in itself may be useful. But let us not forget that mankind requires more than this for life; and that to make it possible for men to live lives worthy of humanity is no small achievement.

The duty of the Social Democratic leaders, then, is to support every social reform which tends to ameliorate the lives of the masses, no matter from what quarter it comes, and at the same time to keep their eyes fixed on their final goal. If they do this they will have a practical policy that will be free from the danger of opportunism. Not Socialism *or* Social Reform, but Socialism *and* Social Reform will be the policy of the leaders if they are wise.

Born up with this is the important question which the Social Democratic leaders will have to face: What should be their relation to the non-socialist parties?

Only the old-fashioned conception of the class war

could lead to the belief that the proletariat must be in opposition to all other elements of the population. One can understand that a small sect in its early days should wish to remain apart. Small sects usually do. It is important that their member should profess the faith in all its purity, and should be enthusiastic in the cause. Contact with the outside world, and with stronger bodies, has the danger of weakening both the faith and the enthusiasm, and is therefore suicidal. But when a party has increased enormously, the danger appears to be insignificant.

One would have thought that the Socialist movement had reached such a stage of development as to be free from fear of harmful influences from without, and that it would not object, therefore, to unite with other parliamentary parties in case of need. Experience has proved that a combination of Social Democrats with non-socialist groups has in no wise endangered the idea of the class war and the socialist goal. Of course, such a combination pre-supposes the rejection of such antiquated ideas as that of "the great day," or "the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," or of "violent revolution." At the same time, it is necessary to be fully conscious of the real value and importance of one's own party. For if, on the one hand, the policy of a party of standing apart is a sign of weakness, it may be due, on the other hand, to an over-estimation of strength. I believe that the Social Democrats in Germany are suffering from this form of conceit. The enormous number of votes cast in their favour at the elections has led them to believe that they have an extraordinary influence in Parliament. But, as a matter of fact, in actual practice their influence is not very large. It is, of course, impossible to judge of the socialist movement in any country merely by the number of socialist votes. If it were possible, we should have to admit that the movement in Germany is stronger than anywhere else. But I believe that quite the contrary is the case. I believe that nowhere in civilized lands has it a weaker position

than in Germany, despite its three million votes. Jaurès made this quite clear at the Amsterdam Congress, when he said—

“Europe and the world are oppressed at the present moment by something which is weakening the guarantee of peace, lessening the chances of the realization of political liberty, and hindering the progress of Socialism, and of the working classes; in a word, it is a stumbling-block to all political and social progress all over the world. I am thinking not of the compromises made by the French Socialists with the democratic parties in order to help forward freedom and progress and peace. No. It is the political weakness of the German Social Democratic party that is in my mind. (Expressions of surprise on all sides.)

“At the Dresden Congress, which was held after the great political victory when three million votes were registered for the party, we expected that you would adopt some definite policy, some course of action. You cried out joyfully in your newspapers, ‘The Empire is ours. Ours is the world!’ My friends, you were mistaken. The Empire is not yet yours. Why, you are not even certain whether the International Socialist Congress will be allowed to take place in your capital!”

There is little doubt that the powerlessness of the German Social Democratic party is due to an exaggerated notion of its strength, and the tendency to gloss over real weakness by fine phrases. Moreover, it has shown itself incapable of combining with other parties in order to bring about certain reforms which were sorely needed.

But we must remember that in all lands (with, perhaps, the exception of Australia) Socialism is to-day, and will continue to be in the near future, the faith of only a small minority. It would be a good thing if the leaders of the movement took this thought to heart.

One other fact has been ascribed to class war by those who hold antiquated ideas of it. They say that class war meant not human love but human hate. I do not think that is correct. I believe that in the class war it is quite possible to think of our common humanity, and of that which unites all men in one family, as well as of the things which separate them in the social struggle.

The agents in the struggle are men, with the same joys and the same sorrows, for whom God and the world, birth and death, youth and age, love and friendship, fidelity

and treachery, health and sickness, all mean the same to those on the one side as on the other, and the social struggle, when all is said, is but a small affair compared with these things.

"See! we hate, we struggle, we are separated by different views and feelings,
But your hair, like mine, is showing locks of grey."

It is quite possible to respect the man in one's opponent. Have we not all been able to do so in our own experience?

For the class that is striving to restore the old humanistic ideal of humanity, this ought to be an accepted principle. How can it be otherwise? Is it conceivable that the proletariat should hate a portion of their fellow-men until they obtain the power in the State, and then all at once turn their hate into love? Is it possible to be enthusiastic for the idea of a common humanity, and at the same time hate three-fourths of humanity because they hold different political views, or have different economic interests? It is true that the average Socialist in many (not all) countries is an embittered, morose individual, who gives one the impression that he hates all the world. But his appearance and his feelings are not due to the class war. That war can, and ought to be, carried on with clean, and not poisoned, weapons. How much is sinned in this respect on both sides! To speak slightly of one's opponent, or to ascribe low motives to his actions, is hardly necessary, and does not in the least strengthen one's own position. Nay, any one who adopts a policy of war and of struggle, who regards war and struggle as having been the means of bringing about all that has occurred in history, ought to find no difficulty in fighting fairly, and respecting the motives of his opponent, believing that they are just as disinterested as his own.

And why? Because such a man looks on conflict and struggle as being natural, just as much as the thunderstorm is natural. Only he who regards war as something artificial, brought about by wicked men, will think that

the motives of his opponents are wicked. But once a man realizes that the class war is inevitable, that it must come from the very nature of social life, that it is nothing but the opposition of two differing opinions, each with its own outlook on life, he will perceive that his opponent is fighting from as good impulses as his own. And so he will be able to respect the man in him. He will not despise or mock him; he will fight him fairly and squarely.

Let us learn this lesson from England, where the opposing forces fight like gentlemen. I trust that this will be the case soon on the Continent also, for a fair fight shows a truer conception of what class war means.

The Germans, more than others, need to learn the lesson which Lassalle taught: "To treat an opponent fairly and justly is the first duty of a man, and the working classes more than others should specially lay it to heart."

Then, and only then, will the higher feelings in the human breast have the upper hand over man's passions, and the class war will bring not destruction, but the blessings of civilization. Then, and only then, will it be true to say that "war is the father of all things," and therefore also of those that are good.

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT (1750—1907)

Year.	England.	France.
1750-1800	Important inventions (1764-75 Spinning Jenny, 1780 puddling process, 1785-90 power loom, 1790 steam engine, 1799 paper making machine); rapid growth of the great centres of industry. DESTRUCTION OF MACHINERY AND OF FACTORIES BY THE WORKERS. PETITIONS TO MAKE MACHINES AND FACTORIES ILLEGAL, AND TO RE-INTRODUCE THE ELIZABETHAN STATUTE OF ARTIFICERS. Laws passed to protect machinery.	
1776	Adam Smith (1723-90, <i>Wealth of Nations</i>).	
1796		BABEUF'S CONSPIRACY.
1800	ROBERT OWEN (1771-1858, <i>A new view of society, Book of the new moral world</i>) TAKES OVER FACTORY AT LANARK. Stringent Combination Act.	
1803		CHARLES FOURIER'S (1772-1837) FIRST BOOK OF IMPORTANCE APPEARS— <i>Théorie des quatre mouvements</i> . (1822, <i>Théorie de l'unité universelle</i> ; 1824, <i>Le nouveau monde industriel et sociétaire</i> .)
1813-14	Repeal of the Statute of Artificers.	
1815-32	THE PROLETARIAT STRUGGLE FOR THE REMOVAL OF PERSONAL DISABILITIES.	
1819	The <i>Savannah</i> arrives in Liverpool.	
1821		SAINT SIMON'S (1760-1825) IMPORTANT BOOK <i>du système industriel</i> appears. (1825, <i>Nouveau Christianisme</i> .)

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.
1825	Repeal of the Combination Acts. RISE OF TRADE-UNIONS.		
1831	Manchester and Liverpool Railway opened.		
1830-48		July monarchy. Wonderful economic development. "Enrichissez-vous, Messieurs!"	
1830-32		AGITATION IN FRANCE AND BELGIUM OF HAZARD AND ENFANTIN, DISCIPLES OF ST. SIMON.	
1831		RISE OF THE LYONS SILK WEAVERS: <i>Preuve en travaillant ou mourir en combattant.</i>	
1832	Reform Bill.		
1833	First legislation to protect factory workers.		FIRST GERMAN WORKMEN'S EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOUNDED AT BIEL.
1834	Grand National Consolidated Trade Union (influence of Robert Owen).		
1836		ACTIVITY OF THE FOLLOWERS OF FOURIER (VICTOR CONSIDERANT) IN FRANCE AND BELGIUM. APPEARANCE OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS (DE LA MENNAIS) "ICARIAN" COMMUNISM OF CABET (<i>Voyage en Icarie</i> , 1840). CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT OF BUCHEZ (b. 1796).	
1837-48	CHARTIST MOVEMENT. Six points. LOVETT, FERGUS O'CONNOR.		

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.
1838			GRÜTH UNION FOUNDED. AT FIRST NOT A POLITICAL, AFTER 1848 LIBERAL.
1839-54	ACTIVITY OF THOMAS CARLYLE (<i>Past and Present</i> 1843) AND THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS (CHARLES KINGSLEY, THOMAS HUGHES, MAURICE).		
1839		LOUIS BLANC'S (1813-22) <i>Organization du travail</i> .	
1840	Roland Hill's penny postage introduced. Telegraphs along railroads.	ZENITH OF ANARCHIST, COMMUNIST CLUBISM (cf. p. 157). <i>Société des Travailleurs égalitaires</i> . P. J. PROUDHON'S (1809-65) <i>Qu'est ce que la propriété</i> .	
1841			COMMUNIST MOVEMENTS, WEITLING, FROBEL, TREICHLER.
1846	ROCHDALE PIONEERS.		
1847			
1848		FEBRUARY REVOLUTION IN PARIS. PROLETARIAT REPRESENTED IN THE GOUVERNEMENT PROVISoire BY LOUIS BLANC AND ALBERT. 23 AND 24 JUNE, JUNE REVOLUTION; THE PROLETARIAT CRUSHED IN STREET FIGHTS.	

Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Italy.	International.
UNREST AMONG THE WEAVERS IN LANGENBIELAU AND PETERSWALDAU. RIOTS IN Breslau.			
			THE "UNION OF THE JUST" (FOUNDED 1836. AFTER 1840 ITS CENTRE IS IN LONDON) BECOMES THE "UNION OF THE COMMUNISTS," TAKING THE <i>Communist Manifesto</i> , THE WORK OF KARL MARX (1818-83) AND FREDERICK ENGELS (1820-95), AS ITS PROGRAMME. <i>Proletarians of all lands, unite!</i>
COMMUNIST AGITATION IN RHEIN DISTRICT BY KARL MARX AND OTHERS (<i>Neue Rheinische Zeitung</i> FROM 1-VI-48 TO 19-V-49).	Liberation of peasants. PARTICIPATION OF WORKERS IN THE POLITICAL STRUGGLES.	MAZZINI ESTABLISHED FIRST WORKERS' UNIONS ON THE BASIS OF <i>mutuo soccorso</i> .	

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.
1849				
1850	England occupies a unique position in the world market.			WORKMEN'S UNIONS FOUNDED IN ALL DIRECTIONS.
"	GROWTH OF TRADE-UNIONS.			
1851	THE AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS FOUNDED.			
1852				
1857				
1858			THE GERMAN WORKMEN'S EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS COMBINE INTO ONE FEDERATION. PRINTERS' TRADE-UNION FOUNDED.	
1862				DEPUTATION OF WORKING MEN FROM LEIPZIG MET THE LEADERS OF THE NATIONAL PARTY IN BERLIN, AND WERE TOLD THAT THEY MIGHT BECOME "HONORARY MEMBERS" OF THE PARTY.
1863				FERDINAND LASSALLE (1825-64). MARCH 1, "OPEN LETTER TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO SUMMON A GENERAL CONGRESS OF WORKERS IN GERMANY." MAY 23: General German Workmen's Union founded by Lassalle. Split after Lassalle's death; one section led by Becker and Schweitzer, the other by Countess Hatzfeld.

Scandinavia & Lands.	Italy.	International.
<p>MARCUS THIRANI. (1817-99), SCHOOL TEACHER & JOURNAL- IST, BEGAN AGITATIONS IN NORWAY, AND FOUNDED MANY WORKERS' UNIONS. Legal recognition in Denmark of liberty of speech, liberty of the press, and liberty of conscience.</p>		
		<p>Stringent measures in all countries against the workers. Period of reaction. General economic prosperity resulting from the increased supply in the precious metals.</p> <p>First International Exhibition in London.</p>
<p>Industry made free in Denmark.</p>		<p>THE "UNION OF THE COM- MUNISTS" CEASES TO EXIST.</p>
		<p>International Exhibition in Lon- don. Period of Free Trade commenced.</p>
	<p>THE MAZZINI UNIONS BECAME 453 IN NUMBER, WITH A MEMBERSHIP OF 111,663.</p>	

APPENDIX

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.
1864		Legal recognition of the right to strike.	J. P. BECKER (<i>d.</i> DEC. 7, 1886) FOUNDED THE FIRST SECTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKMEN'S ASSOCIATION.		
1865				COMMENCEMENT OF TRADE UNION MOVEMENT - TOBACCO WORKERS (1866, PRINTERS).	PRINTERS' UNION. "HERMANNIA" STARTED FRIENDLY SOCIETY BRANCH.
1866					
1867	SEVERE STRUGGLE OF THE TRADE-UNIONS FOR RECOGNITION.		GERMAN GROUP OF THE INTERNATIONAL FOUNDED UNDER LEADERSHIP OF BECKER.	Extended franchise and voting by ballot.	MASS MEETING IN VIENNA, FOUNDATION OF A WORKMEN'S EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION WITH A COMMENCING MEMBERSHIP OF 1000.
1868			FEDERATION OF GERMAN WORKMEN'S EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS JOINS THE INTERNATIONAL GUTLI UNION BY A LARGE MAJORITY REFUSES TO DO SO. TRADE-UNIONS FOUNDED.		4000 MORE WORKERS JOIN THE EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION. NINTH CONGRESS OF WORKERS AT NUREMBERG. OBERWINDER AND HARTUNG DELEGATES.
1869			THE GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION JOINS THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.	General economic progress. Wealth increases, especially after the war. THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY FOUNDED AT THE EISENACH CONGRESS, BEBEL (<i>d.</i> 1840);	LIEBKNECHT IN VIENNA. GOVERNMENT TAKES UP REFACTIONARY POSITION OVER AGAINST LABOUR MOVEMENT. DEMONSTRATION IN FRONT OF THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Scandinavian Lands	Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	International.
EILERT SUNDT (1817-75) FOUNDED THE WORKMEN'S SOCIETY IN CHRISTIANIA.				THE INTERNATIONAL WORKMEN'S ASSOCIATION FOUNDED BY DELEGATES FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES WHO HAD MET AT THE EXHIBITION IN LONDON. INAUGURAL ADDRESS AND CONSTITUTION, BOTH BY KARL MARX. THE GENERAL COMMITTEE CENTRED IN LONDON.
CO-OPERATIVE STORE ESTABLISHED IN CHRISTIANIA.	MICHAEL BAKUNIN (1814-76) IN ITALY. INTERNATIONAL MADE GOOD PROGRESS. CARLO CASIERO (1846-92)			
		TRADE UNION CONGRESS IN NEW YORK. NATIONAL LABOUR UNION.		FIRST CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AT GENEVA.
		National (Reform) Labour Party founded.		VOL. I OF KARL MARX'S <i>Capital</i> PUBLISHED. SECOND CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AT LAUSANNE.
			A PURELY SOCIALIST LABOUR MOVEMENT COMMENCED IN BELGIUM UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL.	MICHAEL BAKUNIN FOUNDED THE <i>Alliance internationale de la démocratie sociale</i> , WITH ANARCHIST TENDENCIES AND OPPOSED TO THE MARXIAN INTERNATIONAL. THIRD CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AT BRUSSELS.
		"KNIGHTS OF LABOUR," FOUNDED BY URIAH S. STEPHENS. THEY WERE A BODY, PARTLY OF THE CHARACTER OF FREEMASONS, AND PARTLY OF A SOCIALIST TRADE-UNION.	FOUNDATION OF A DUTCH SECTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL. LABOUR MOVEMENT COMMENCES IN HOLLAND.	FOURTH CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AT BASEL.

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.
1869				W. LEBKNECHT (1826-1900). FEDERATION OF HIRSCH - DUNCCKER TRADE-UNIONS FOUNDED. CATHOLIC UNIONS DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT FROM CATHOLIC STANDPOINT.	FIRST WORKMEN'S INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION.
1870			A SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY FOUNDED IN SWITZERLAND.		OBERWINDER, MOST, AND OTHERS ACCUSED OF HIGH TREASON. ALL WORKMEN'S EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND TRADE-UNIONS DISBANDED.
1871	Trade Union Act recognizes Trade Unions.	Rising of the Paris Commune.			THE HOHENWARTH - SCHÜFFLE MINISTRY GRANTS A GENERAL AMNESTY.
1872		LAW AGAINST THE INTERNATIONAL.		Economic prosperity. "Showers of Millions." Period of great business enterprises.	ELECTORAL REFORM DISCUSSED.
1873			THE FIRST SWISS LABOUR UNION FOUNDED, CONSISTING OF TRADE-UNIONS, EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND A SMALL PORTION OF THE GRÜTLI UNIONS.		

Scandinavian Lands.	Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	International.
		SECTION I. (GERMAN) OF THE INTERNATIONAL FOUND.ED.		
		SECTION II. (FRENCH) OF THE INTERNATIONAL FOUND.ED.		
SOCIALIST AGITATION COMMENCED IN DENMARK (LOUIS PIO). SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL FOUND.ED. FEDERATION OF 200 CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES IN NORWAY.	GARIBALDI AND HIS FOLLOWERS SHOW THEIR SYMPATHY WITH THE INTERNATIONAL.	FIRST CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL IN AMERICA (North American Federation of the International Working-men's Association).		
	CONGRESS IN RIMINI THE ITALIAN INTERNATIONAL SIDES WITH BAKUNIN AGAINST MARX. Andrea Costa in the Romagna.		GENERAL (LIBERAL) NETHERLAND WORKMEN'S UNION FOUNDED. (<i>Algemeen Nederlandsch Werklieden Verbond</i> = A.N.W.V.).	FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AT THE HAGUE. BAKUNIN AND HIS FOLLOWING EXCLUDED FROM THE INTERNATIONAL. HE LEADS THE <i>Fédération jurassienne</i> . THE SEAT OF THE INTERNATIONAL MOVED TO NEW YORK.
THE INTERNATIONAL BANNED FROM DENMARK. PIO AND HIS FOLLOWERS SENT TO PRISON FOR A TERM OF YEARS.				CONGRESS OF THE <i>Fédération jurassienne</i> AT GENEVA REGARDED BY SOME AS THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL.

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1874						Danish government takes strong measures against Labour movement. Trade-unions increase in strength.
1875	Conspiracy & Law of Property Acts.		THE FEDERATION OF GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, MEETS TO EXIST.	UNION OF MARXISTS, AND OF THE FOLLOWERS OF LASSALLE AT THE GOTHA CONGRESS. FAMOUS GOTHA PROGRAMME.	OBERWINDER EXCLUDED FROM EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION. AUSTRIAN PARTY SPLIT INTO TWO WINGS, THE RADICALS AND THE MIDDLE PARTY.	
1876		FIRST CONGRESS OF GENERAL FRENCH LABOUR PARTY.				FIRST CONGRESS OF DANISH SOCIAL DEMOCRATS AT COPENHAGEN.
1877						PIO & GELEFF MAKE OFF TO AMERICA, TAKING WITH THEM MONEY BELONGING TO THE POLICE.
1878			The Factory Act adopted by a popular vote on 21-x-77 with 181,200 votes for and 17,985 against, became law. LABOUR UNION ACCEPTS A PROGRAMME MODELLED ON THAT OF THE GERMAN	Law against Socialists. Almost all Working-men's Societies crushed out of existence. SOCIALIST AGITATION IN GERMANY FROM FOREIGN CENTRES (ZURICH AND LON-		FOUNDATION OF SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION IN DENMARK.

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
Pius IX, by the Bull <i>Non expedit</i> , forbids Catholics to take any part in Italian politics. GOVERNMENT SUPPRESS THE INTERNATIONAL ITS SECTIONS AND GROUPS ABOLISHED.	Economic depression. Socialism develops in consequence. "THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC WORKINGMEN'S PARTY OF NORTH AMERICA" FOUNDED BY THOSE SECTIONS EXPELLED FROM THE INTERNATIONAL.	Beginning of Protective Legislation in Holland (child-labour).		"SEVENTH" CONGRESS (cf. under 1873) AT BRUSSELS.
		FOUNDATION OF THE <i>Chambre du Travail, fédération des sociétés ouvrières bruxelloises</i> OUT OF THE REMAINS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OF P. O. BERTRAND.		General period of depression begins, lasting to the end of the eighties.
	MARK WINDS UP THE INTERNATIONAL AT PHILADELPHIA WORKING-MEN'S PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES FOUNDED (AFTER 1877 KNOWN AS SOCIALIST LABOUR PARTY OF NORTH AMERICA).	FOUNDATION OF <i>Parti ouvrier socialiste flamand</i> . VAN BEVEREN, ANSELE AND THE <i>Parti socialiste brabançon</i> .		FORMAL WINDING UP OF THE INTERNATIONAL "EIGHTH" CONGRESS AT BERNE.
RIOT OF INTERNATIONALISTS AT BENEVENTI.	GREAT STRIKE OF RAILWAY MEN.	CHRISTIAN LABOUR UNION "PATRIMONIUM" FOUNDED IN HOLLAND.	Stephen Nikolai-evitch Chalturin, "the Father of the Russian labour movement," founds the Northern Union of Russian labourers.	Attempt of followers of Marx and Bakunin to come together again — fails.
PROF. PIETRO ELLERO'S BOOK <i>La Tirannide Borghese</i> STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THE STATE TO BEGIN WORK OF SOCIAL REFORM.	GREENBACK LABOUR PARTY, A MILLION VOTES.	SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY FOUNDED IN AMSTERDAM.		

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1878			SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY, BUT GRUHLI UNION ONLY PARTIALLY ADOPTS IT. ATTEMPT TO BRING THE TWO WINGS TOGETHER FAILED.	DON). FOUNDATION OF A CONSERVATIVE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST PARTY BY STOCKER.		
1879		LABOUR CONGRESS IN MARSEILLES. THE COLLECTIVISTS FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THE MAJORITY.				
1880		LABOUR CONGRESS IN HAVRE. SPLIT INTO RADICALS AND MIDDLE PARTY, WHO FOUND <i>Parti ouvrier (révolutionnaire) socialiste français (P.O.F.)</i> , AND THIS CONTAINS BESIDE THE <i>Parti socialiste révolutionnaire (P.S.R.)</i> OF THE FOLLOWERS OF BLANQUI.	LABOUR UNION BREAKS UP INTO THREE SECTIONS (1) THE GENERAL TRADE UNION, (2) GERMAN SOCIALISTS' UNION IN SWITZERLAND, (3) SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF SWITZERLAND.			LABOUR PARTY IN CHRISTIANIA CALLS A CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF ALL WORKERS TO DISCUSS REFORMS.
1881	SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION (S.D.F.) FOUNDED, IN THE SPIRIT OF MARX, UNDER LEADERSHIP OF M. H. HYNDMAN.			THE IMPERIAL MESSAGE OF THE 17 NOV. MARKS THE BEGINNING OF AN ERA OF SOCIAL REFORM UNDERTAKEN BY THE STATE.		SOCIALIST AGITATION COMMENCES IN SWEDEN (A. PALM).

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
ANDREA COSTA, LEADER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL, JOINS THE EVOLUTIONARY SECTION.		DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS JOINS LABOUR MOVEMENT. FOUNDATION OF <i>Parti Socialiste Belge</i> . THE LABOUR MOVEMENT TAKES PART IN POLITICAL ACTIVITY. MOVEMENT FOR UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE STARTED.	FIRST ISSUE OF SECRET REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST PAPER <i>Scoutpa i Wolpa</i> (Earth and Freedom).	
FOUNDATION OF THE <i>Partito Operaio</i> IN MILAN (CONSTANTINO LAZZARI)—A NEW LABOUR PARTY WITH SOCIALIST TENDENCIES.	ANARCHIST AGITATION COMMENCES.	<i>De Vooruit</i> FOUND-ED IN GHEENT. SOCIALIST CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT BEGINS.	First law limiting child-labour in factories.	
THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOUR FOUNDED. TO-DAY IT INCLUDES FOUR-FIFTHS OF ALL THE TRADE-UNIONS IN THE U.S. SAMUEL GOMPERS WAS ITS FOUNDER.				

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1882		LABOUR CONGRESS AT ST. ETIENNE. SPLIT INTO TWO PARTIES, THE ONE LED BY GUESDE, THE OTHER UNDER PAUL BROUSSE. THE LATTER FOUNDS THE <i>Fédération des travailleurs socialiste de France</i> (F.T.S.).			ANARCHISTS APPEAR. CRIMES OF VIOLENCE. Persecution and deportation of many Socialists.	
1883	FABIAN SOCIETY FOUNDED.		LABOUR CONGRESS IN ZURICH DECIDES TO ESTABLISH CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO UNITE ALL SECTIONS AND ORGANIZE PROPAGANDA. ITS SEAT FIRST AT ZURICH, AFTER 1887 AT BERNE.	State Insurance for workingmen began: Insurance against sickness (1884, Insurance against accidents; 1890, Old age insurance).	Reactionary rescript to regulate industry.	KNUDSEN, A PRINTER, ORGANIZES A CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE NORWEGIAN TRADE-UNIONS.
1884		NEW LAW FOR SYNDICATES GIVES AN IMPETUS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE-UNIONS.		<i>The Vorwarts</i> , THE SOCIALIST DAILY, STARTED.		ELECTION OF THE FIRST TWO SOCIALIST MEMBERS TO THE DANISH FOLKTHING. A DEMOCRATIC LABOUR UNION ESTABLISHED IN CHRISTIANIA. EXTENSION OF THE FRANCHISE IN NORWAY.
1885		<i>Société d'économie sociale</i> FOUNDED BY BENOIT MALON. THIS BECAME THE CENTRE OF THE INDEPENDENT SOCIALISTS (<i>Parti socialiste indépendant</i>).			Eleven Hours' Day for Factory workers.	"CENTRAL ORGANIZATION OF WORKINGMEN'S SOCIETIES" IN NORWAY.

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
<p>Franchise extended. ANDREA COSTA FIRST SOCIALIST MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ELECTED BY ORGANIZED WORKERS.</p>			<p>CHALTURIN HANGED.</p>	
<p>(1868-83) <i>La Pebe</i> edited by Enrico Bignami and Dr. Osvaldo Biani.</p>	<p>PROGRESS OF ANARCHISM IN AMERICA (JOHN MOST) DUE TO COMMERCIAL DE- PRESSION (1884- 86).</p>			
		<p>PROSECUTION OF SOCIALISTS IN HOLLAND. <i>Parti ouvrier belge</i> FOUNDED, UNITED ALL SECTIONS OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.</p>		

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1886		THE <i>Fédération des syndicats</i> FOUNDED AT THE LYONS CONGRESS.	GENERAL WORKERS' RESERVE FUND ESTABLISHED. THE FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS AND THE GUTLI UNION BOTH JOIN THE FUND.		BILL INTRODUCED FOR RIGOROUS TREATMENT OF SOCIALISTS. MEETING OF PROTEST. RAPPROCHMENT BETWEEN THE RADICAL AND THE MIDDLE PARTY. THE BILL WITHDRAWN. VICTOR ADLER PUBLISHES THE JOURNAL, <i>Die Gleichheit</i> (Equality).	FIRST CONGRESS OF SCANDINAVIAN WORKERS IN GOETEBURG. REPRESENTATIVES FROM NORWAY, DENMARK AND SWEDEN ADOPT A STRONGLY SOCIALIST POLITICAL PROGRAMME.
1887	THE NEW UNIONISM COMMENCES. THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT JOINED BY LOWER SOCIAL STRATA THAN HITHERTO. INFLUENCE OF JOHN BURNS, TOM MANN, KEIR HARDIE.	<i>Bourse du Travail</i> OPENED IN PARIS.	FIRST SWISS LABOUR UNION FOUNDED, MADE UP OF ALL THE SOCIETIES WHICH REPRESENT LABOUR INTEREST.		PUBLIC MEETING WITH THE OBJECT OF MAKING PEACE AMONG ALL PARTIES.	THE NORWEGIAN LABOUR PARTY AN INDEPENDENT POLITICAL PARTY.
1888			LABOUR PARTY IN SWITZERLAND REORGANIZED. NEW PROGRAMME ADOPTED, HAVING SOCIALIST AIMS.		SOCIALISTS UNITE AT THE CONGRESS AT HAINFELD.	THIRD DANISH SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS AT COPENHAGEN ADOPTS PROGRAMME WHICH IS STILL CURRENT. INDEPENDENT DANISH LABOUR UNION FOUNDED (FERNANDO LINDERBERG).

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
	<p>DOMB OUTRAGE IN CHICAGO. EXECUTION OF THREE ANARCHIST LEADERS. ANARCHIST MOVEMENT COLLAPSES. LIEBKNECHT AND AVELING TOUR THE STATES FOR PROPAGANDA PURPOSES. EIGHT HOURS' DAY MOVEMENT. <i>The Knights of Labour</i> REACH THE ZENITH OF THEIR POWER.</p>	<p><i>Maison du Peuple</i> FOUNDED. GREAT STRIKES OF GLASS-WORKERS AND MINERS. THE SOCIALISTS PARTICIPATE IN THE ELECTIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME.</p>		
		<p>AT THE CONGRESS AT DAMPREMY, OF THE P. O. B., THERE IS A SPLIT BETWEEN FLEMINGS AND WALLOONS. THE LATTER FOUND THE <i>Parti republicain socialiste</i>, HAVING A REVOLUTIONARY POLICY.</p>		<p>INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE IN PARIS.</p>
	<p>SOCIALIST LABOUR PARTY TAKES PART IN THE ELECTIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME.</p>			<p>INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION CONGRESS SUMMONED TO LONDON BY ENGLISH TRADE-UNIONS. GERMAN, AUSTRIAN, SWISS, AND AMERICAN UNIONS NOT REPRESENTED.</p>

Year.	England. ^a	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1889					State insurance against accidents ^a and sickness.	NORWEGIAN LABOUR PARTY DECLARES ITS ADHESION TO SOCIALISM (KNUDSEN, PRESIDENT). SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY CONSTITUTED IN SWEDEN.
1890	The Trade Union Congress at Liverpool decides by 193 votes against 155 for the legal recognition of an Eight Hours' Day.			Fall of Bismarck. The law against socialists not renewed.	THE FIRST OF MAY CELEBRATIONS MORE COMPLETE IN AUSTRIAN ELSEWHERE. DEMAND FOR MANHOOD SUFFRAGE AND VOTING BY BALLOT.	THE THIRD SCANDINAVIAN TRADE UNION MEETING AT CHRISTIANIA DECLARES ITS ADOPTION OF SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES.
1891			GENERAL WORKERS' RESERVE FUND BECOMES PART OF GENERAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS.	THE ERFURT PROGRAMME OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY, STRONG MARXIAN INFLUENCE. SOCIALISTS WITH ANARCHIST TENDENCIES LEAVE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.		

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
				TWO INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONGRESSES IN PARIS, ONE ARRANGED BY THE GUESDISTS AND THE OTHER BY THE FOLLOWERS OF BROUSSE. ADOPTION OF AN EIGHT HOURS' DAY AND THE CELEBRATION OF LABOUR DAY ON 1ST MAY RECOMMENDED. (THE FIRST "NEW" INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.)
		P.R.S. JOINS P.O.B. DE PABSE DIES. ANARCHIST TENDENCIES GROW IN STRENGTH.		THE FIRST OF MAY CELEBRATED AS LABOUR DAY FOR THE FIRST TIME IN ALL CIVILIZED COUNTRIES. FIRST INTERNATIONAL MINERS CONFERENCE AT JOLIMONT. International Conference for the protection of workers, summoned by the Emperor William II. Representatives from 13 States.
<i>Critica Sociale</i> FOUNDED IN MILAN FOR THE PROPAGATION OF MARXIAN DOCTRINES; EDITED BY TURATI AND DR. ANNA KULISCIOFF.				SECOND INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONGRESS AT BRUSSELS. ANARCHISTS EXCLUDED FROM PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE CONGRESSES. ENCYCLICAL OF LEO XIII. <i>Rerum novarum</i> FIXES PROGRAMME OF ALL CATHOLIC SOCIAL MOVEMENTS.

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1892		SOCIALIST CONGRESS AT MARSEILLES ADOPTS A PROGRAMME OF AGRARIAN REFORM, ADVOCATING SMALL-HOLDINGS. ALLEMANE LEAVES THE FULFILLERS OF BROUSSE AND FOUNDS THE <i>Parti ouvrier Socialiste révolutionnaire français.</i> (Allemanists P.O.S.R.)	THE GRÜTLI UNION ADOPTS THE PROGRAMME OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY, BUT REFUSES TO JOIN THE PARTY ITSELF.	FIRST GENERAL TRADE UNION CONGRESS AT HALBERSTADT.		The State in Denmark contributes to the insurance funds against sickness.
1893	INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY (I. L. P.) FOUNDED UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF KEIR HARDIE.	FIRST CONGRESS OF THE <i>Fédération des Bourses du Travail</i> . FIRST GREAT SOCIALIST SUCCESSES AT THE ELECTIONS: 40 SEATS CAPTURED. JEAN JAURÈS, MILLERAND AND HIS FRIENDS INFLUENTIAL.		SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECEIVES 147,866,738 VOTES AT THE ELECTIONS TO THE REICHSTAG, AND IS THUS THE STRONGEST OF ALL THE PARTIES FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF VOTES. Reactionary period commences. "The era of Stumm."	AGITATION FOR THE SUFFRAGE, STARTED BY THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS, STIRS UP THE WHOLE COUNTRY. Taaffe's Reform Bill. His fall. Coalition Ministry.	SUFFRAGE AGITATION COMMENCED IN SWEDEN.
1894	THE TRADE-UNION CONGRESS AT NORWICH DECIDES BY A MAJORITY OF VOTES IN FAVOUR OF THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE INSTRUMENTS OF PRODUCTION.			NAUMANN, A CLERGYMAN, STARTS THE NATIONAL SOCIAL MOVEMENT. THE GERMAN CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES FOUND A WHOLESALE SOCIETY IN HAMBURG.		

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
CONGRESS AT GENOA. ALL SOCIALIST SECTIONS UNITED INTO ONE PARTY HAVING COLLECTIVIST AIMS AND REGARDING THE CLASS WAR AS ITS WRAPON. SEPARATION FROM ANARCHISTS.		CONGRESS OF CATHOLIC WORKERS DECIDE TO REMAIN APART AND NOT TO JOIN THE OTHER GROUPS.	FIRST GREAT STRIKE IN LOUVE (60,000 WORKERS).	
HUNGER RIOTS IN SICILY AND ELSEWHERE.		STRIKES AND RIOTS FOR THE CHAMBER ON APRIL 18 TO ADOPT THE <i>vote plural</i> .		THIRD INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONGRESS AT ZURICH; THE ENGLISH TRADE-UNIONS TAKE PART OFFICIALLY IN THE DELIBERATIONS OF CONTINENTAL SOCIALISTS.
SPECIAL LEGISLATION OF CRISPI AGAINST ANARCHISTS; USED, HOWEVER, TO PROSECUTE SOCIALISTS.		SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY FOUNDED IN HOLLAND ON BASIS OF MARXIAN TEACHING. DIAMOND WORKERS' UNION ESTABLISHED IN AMSTERDAM STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ANARCHISTS. CONGRESS OF THE BELGIAN LABOUR PARTY AT QUAREGNON. FIRST GREAT VICTORY OF THE SOCIALISTS AT THE ELECTIONS. THEY OBTAINED 300,000 VOTES OUT OF 1,900,000, AND CAPTURED 28 SEATS.	THE RUSSO-POLISH SOCIALIST LABOUR PARTY FOUNDED.	FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF TEXTILE WORKERS AT MANCHESTER.

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1895		THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF LABOUR (CONFÉDÉRATION GÉNÉRALE DU TRAVAIL) FOUNDED.			Anti-semitic tendencies in Labour circles obtain the ascendancy in Vienna and Lower Austria. Liberals powerless.	Parliamentary Divisions increased in Denmark: more seats. EIGHT SOCIALISTS IN THE FOLKTHING.
1896			THE FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS ADOPTS SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES: DEMANDS SOCIALIZATION OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION.			HJALMAR BRANTING ELECTED TO THE SWEDISH PARLIAMENT WITH THE HELP OF THE LIBERALS.
1897	GREAT STRIKE OF ENGINEERS. CRISIS IN THE ENGLISH TRADE UNIONS. SOCIALIST TENDENCIES STRENGTHENED. Workmen's Compensation Acts: England follows Continental countries in a policy of social reform.				PARTY RE-ORGANIZED. THE DIFFERENT NATIONALITIES RECEIVE A LARGE MEASURE OF AUTONOMY. Struggle of Nationalities breaks out in Austria. Badeni falls (27 Nov.). 17 SOCIALISTS ELECTED UNDER THE NEW SUFFRAGE.	
1898	ATTEMPTS TO UNITE THE I.L.P. WITH THE S.U.F. FAIL.			AT THE ELECTIONS TO THE REICHSTAG, 2,107,100 VOTES WERE REGISTERED FOR THE S.D. PARTY; IT OBTAINED 56 SEATS. Kaiser's speech	FIRST PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATS IN AUSTRIA.	SWEDISH LABOUR UNION (SVENSKA ARBETAREFÖRBUNDET), FOUNDED PURELY AS A TRADE-UNION. DUTCH TRADE UNIONS CENTRALIZED.

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
A POLITICAL, TRADE-UNIONIST, CATHOLIC, SOCIAL PARTY FOUNDED— <i>Democrazia Sociale</i> . Dr. Romolo Murri.				A period of prosperity commences in most countries owing to an enormous increase in the production of gold.
	SOCIALIST TRADE AND LABOUR ALLIANCE (DE LEON) FOUNDED IN HOSTILITY TO THE UNIONS.			THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONGRESS IN LONDON.
	SOCIAL DEMOCRACY OF AMERICA FOUNDED (EUGENE DEBBES).	SPIT IN THE SOCIALIST UNION; THE ANARCHISTS ORGANIZE THEMSELVES INTO SMALL GROUPS UNDER THE NAME OF "FREE SOCIALISTS." THE REST OF THE UNION JOINS THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY. EXTENDED FRANCHISE IN HOLLAND. FIRST ELECTIONERING CAMPAIGN OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY. REGISTERED 11,000 VOTES AND VAN KOL AND TROELSTRA ELECTED.	Work in factories restricted to 11½ hours a day. RUSSO-JEWISH SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY (THE "BUND") FOUNDED.	INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS FOR PROTECTION OF WORKERS AT ZÜRICH, ATTENDED BY ALL LABOUR SOCIETIES OF ALL POLITICAL OR RELIGIOUS TENDENCIES. A Congress for the same purpose held at Brussels, attended by non-Labour representatives (scholars, politicians).
RISINGS IN ALL PARTS OF ITALY, DUE TO DEAR BREAD AND GENERAL ECONOMIC DEPRESSION. STREET FIGHTS IN MILAN LASTING THREE DAYS (MAY 6-9). Socialists, Anarch-	SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF AMERICA FOUNDED.	TRADE-UNIONS IN BELGIUM RECOGNIZED AS CORPORATIONS IN LAW.	RUSSIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY FOUNDED ON MARXIAN BASIS.	

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavia Lands.
				at Oehenhansen, wherein he suggested that those who persuaded others to stop work should be imprisoned.		Universal suffrage in Norway.
1899		MILLERAND A MEMBER OF THE ALDEK-ROUSSEAU CABINET. THIS ADDS TO THE DIFFERENCES AMONG THE VARIOUS SECTIONS. AT THE NATIONAL CONGRESS AT PARIS, HOWEVER, AN ATTEMPT IS MADE TO UNITE ALL (6) THE SOCIALIST GROUPS INTO ONE CENTRAL BODY, AND IT IS SUCCESSFUL. THEY ARE ALL REPRESENTED IN THE <i>Comité général socialiste</i> .		FIRST CONGRESS OF THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST TRADE UNIONS IN BERLIN. PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS AT HANOVER. "BERNSTEIN DEBATE." Reichstag rejects the proposal of making the attempt to persuade others to stop work punishable by a term of imprisonment.	GREAT DEMONSTRATION OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS AGAINST THE THUN MINISTRY. THE BRUNN "PROGRAMME OF NATIONAL AUTONOMY."	THE SWEDISH TRADE-UNIONS CLOSELY ALLIED WITH THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.
1900	LABOUR REPRESENTATION COMMITTEE (L.R.C.) ESTABLISHED, MADE UP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE I.L.P., THE FABIANS AND THE TRADE-UNIONS. ITS AIM: TO ORGANIZE AN INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY.	THE GOVERNMENT TAKES STERN MEASURES AGAINST THE STRIKERS AT CHALONSUR-SAONE. CONFLICT AMONG THE SOCIALISTS ONCE MORE. THE GUESDISTS LEAVE THE REST OF THE PARTY.	THE TRADE UNION FEDERATION ADOPTS NEW RULES, WHICH LIMIT ITS ACTIVITIES TO PURELY TRADE-UNION ONES.		GREAT STRIKE OF COAL MINERS LEADS TO THE LEGAL RECOGNITION IN 1902 OF AN EIGHT HOURS' DAY IN COAL MINES.	FIRST ELECTIONEERING SUCCESS OF THE LABOUR PARTY IN N O R W A Y (7,000 VOTES).

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
ists, Republicans, Radicals and Clericals proceeded against. General reaction.				
SOCIALISTS, REPUBLICANS AND RADICALS COMBINE TO FIGHT THE REACTIONARY PARTY.	SPLIT IN THE SOCIALIST LABOUR PARTY.	SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO STRENGTHEN TRADE - UNION MOVEMENT. Proportional representation adopted in Belgium. THE NEW MAISON DU PEUPLE OPENED AT BRUSSELS.		
TWENTY - THREE SOCIALISTS SENT TO PARLIAMENT. FIRST GREAT GENERAL STRIKE IN GENOA SUCCESSFUL. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS RISE FOR HIGHER WAGES.		<i>Fédération des co-opératives socialiste belges</i> FOUNDED. Old age pension scheme adopted. 467,326 SOCIALIST VOTES REGISTERED AT THE ELECTIONS. THE SOCIALIST PARTY BECOMES THE SECOND IN POINT OF NUMBERS.	<i>Iskra</i> (The Spark), THE ORGAN OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY, BEGINS TO APPEAR.	THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION AT PARIS. MANY INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES HELD, AMONG THEM THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONGRESS. AN INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY BUREAU ESTABLISHED AT BRUSSELS. The International Association for the Legal Protection of Workers established, with its seat in Switzerland. Leo XIII's Encyclical <i>Graves de communi Re</i> forbids the <i>Democratia Cristiana</i> participating in any political activity.

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1901	THE TAFF VALE DECISION BY THE HOUSE OF LORDS MADE THE TRADE UNIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL LIABILITIES OF THEIR REPRESENTATIVES.	CONGRESS AT LYONS, THE GUESDISTS ABSENT; THE MILLERAND CASE DISCUSSED; THE BLANQUISTS RETIRE.		SOCIETY FOR SOCIAL REFORM: THE GERMAN BRANCH OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE LEGAL PROTECTION OF WORKERS, FOUNDED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF ALL PARTIES WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS WHO, THOUGH INVITED, REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE.	10 th SOCIALISTS RETURNED AT THE ELECTIONS.	GENERAL SUFFRAGE FOR MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS (ALSO VOTES FOR WOMEN). 150 SOCIAL DEMOCRATS IN MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS IN NORWAY.
1902		FUSION OF THE P.O.F. (GUESDE) WITH THE P.S.R. (VAILLANT) IN THE <i>Parti socialiste de France</i> (<i>P. S. de F.</i>) AT THE CONGRESS AT RHEIMS. AT THE CONGRESS AT TOURS THE <i>Parti socialiste français</i> (<i>P.S.F.</i>) (JAURES, BRIAND), IS CONSTITUTED.	THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY UNITES WITH THE CRUTLI UNION.	AT THE KREUZENACH CONGRESS OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PROLETARIAN AND LOWER MIDDLE CLASS INTERESTS CLASS, AND THE CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES WITH WORKING CLASS MEMBERS LEAVE THE CENTRAL UNION AND ESTABLISH ONE OF THEIR OWN.		GREAT STRIKES ORGANIZED IN SWEDEN IN PROTEST OF THE DELAY OF THE GRANT OF UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE. 4 SOCIAL DEMOCRATS RETURNED TO THE CHAMBER WITH THE HELP OF THE LIBERALS.
1903	THE FIRST CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY JOINS THE L.R.C., WHICH NOW HAS 14 REPRESENTATIVES IN PARLIAMENT.	CONGRESS AT BORDEAUX LARGELY MADE UP OF THE FOLLOWERS OF JAURES. MILLERAND RECEIVES A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE (109 FOR, AND 89 AGAINST).		FIRST GERMAN LABOUR CONGRESS AT FRANKFORT. ATTEMPT TO ORGANIZE ALL WORKERS WHO ARE NOT SOCIAL DEMOCRATS (NUMBERING 620,000). AT THE ELEC-		

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
CONGRESS OF AGRICULTURAL LABORERS AT BOLOGNA THE SOCIETIES (WITH A MEMBERSHIP OF 32,000) DECLARE THEMSELVES IN FAVOUR OF COLLECTIVISM.	CONGRESS AT INDIANAPOLIS OF ALL SOCIALIST GROUPS (EXCEPT THE NEW YORK FACTION OF THE SOCIAL LABOUR PARTY). SOCIALIST PARTY FOUNDED.	GREAT VICTORY OF SOCIAL DEMOCRATS IN HOLLAND AT THE ELECTIONS. 40,000 VOTES ARE REGISTERED IN ITS FAVOUR, AND IT WINS 7 SEATS.		FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF TRADE UNION SECRETARIES.
MOVEMENT FOR THE MUNICIPALIZATION OF BAKERIES. THE SOCIALIST PARTY SUPPORT LIBERAL GOVERNMENT, AND AT THE CONGRESS AT IMOLA THIS POLICY WAS APPROVED.	GREAT STRIKE OF MINERS, SETTLED AFTER MANY WEEKS' DURATION BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.	GREAT STRIKE, ORGANIZED TO BRING ABOUT A REVISION OF THE SUFFRAGE, AKE UNSUCCESSFUL.	PEASANTS' REVOLT IN CHARKOW AND POLTAVA.	
SYNDICALIST TENDENCIES SHOW THEMSELVES IN THE PARTY. <i>Avanguardia Socialista</i> (Arturo Labriola) IN MILAN, and <i>Divenire Sociale</i> (Enrico Leone) IN ROME.		GREAT STRIKE OF RAILWAY SERVANTS IN HOLLAND. ONE RESULT, LEGISLATION WHICH PUNISHES STRIKERS AMONG RAILWAY SERVANTS.		

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
				<p>TIONS TO THE REICHSSTAG 3 MILLION VOTES WERE CAST IN FAVOUR OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS, GIVING THEM 81 SEATS.</p> <p>GREAT DEBATE ON "REVISIONISM" AT THE PARTY CONGRESS IN DRESDEN</p>		
1904	<p>THE FOURTEEN LABOUR REPRESENTATIVES IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BECAME AN INDEPENDENT PARTY. NINETY-FIVE CANDIDATES OF THE L.R.C. SUCCESSFUL AT MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.</p>	<p>MILLERAND EXPELLED FROM THE SEINE FEDERATION. AT THE PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE P.S.F. THE RADICAL WING OBTAINS THE UPPER HAND. JAURÈS PARTS FROM MILLERAND. THE CONGRESS OF THE P.S. DE F. AT LILLY; THE P.S. DE F. DECLARED THE "ONLY" POLITICAL ORGANIZATION OF THE FRENCH PROLETARIAT.</p>	<p>THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY ADOPTS A NEW PROGRAMME</p>			<p>A NON-SOCIALIST CENTRAL OFFICE FOR SOCIAL WORK FOUNDED AT STOCKHOLM (BOCH).</p> <p>AN ASSOCIATION FOR PROPAGATION OF SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE ESTABLISHED AT STOCKHOLM, NORWAY, SWEDEN AND DENMARK REPRESENTED.</p>
1905	<p>AT THE CONFERENCE AT LIVERPOOL THE L.R.C. ADOPTS THE SOCIALIST GOAL AS PART OF ITS PROGRAMME.</p>	<p>The P.S.F. and the P.S. de F. unite at the Congress at Rouen. The new party called <i>Parti Socialiste: section française de l'Internationale ouvrière</i>. CHURCH AND STATE SEPARATED; LARGE-LY THE RESULT OF SOCIALIST AGITATION.</p>	<p>DEFEAT AT THE ELECTIONS. SOCIALISTS HAVE ONLY TWO SEATS IN THE NATIONAL CHAMBER (OUT OF 167).</p>	<p>GREAT STRIKE OF MINERS (200,000) IN WESTPHALIA. ALL TRADE-UNION ORGANIZATIONS PULL TOGETHER.</p> <p>AT THE PARTY CONGRESS AT JENA, GENERAL STRIKE RECOGNIZED AS A WEAPON.</p>	<p>STREET DEMONSTRATIONS AND STRIKES IN SUPPORT OF UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE. BLOODY CONFLICTS IN PRAGUE.</p>	

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
<p>SOCIALIST CONGRESS AT BOLOGNA. FERRI AND LABRIOLA OBTAIN THE UPPER HAND OVER TURATI. PARTY REFUSES TO SUPPORT THE GOVERNMENT.</p> <p>Pius X excepts certain districts from the <i>non expedit</i>.</p> <p>BEGINNING OF A CATHOLIC POPULAR PARTY.</p>	<p>450,000 SOCIALIST VOTES FOR THE PRESIDENCY.</p>		<p>POLITICAL REVOLUTION BREAKS OUT. BLOODY STREET FIGHTS IN MANY TOWNS.</p>	<p>Franco-Italian Labour agreement; first step towards international agreements among workers.</p> <p>THE SIXTH SOCIALIST CONGRESS AT AMSTERDAM.</p>
<p>TRADE-UNION CONGRESS AT GENOA. GENERAL STRIKE RECOGNIZED AS A TRADE-UNION WEAPON.</p>	<p>INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD. A REVOLUTIONARY TRADE-UNION ORGANIZATION IN OPPOSITION TO THE A. F. OF L.</p> <p>Upton Sinclair's novel, <i>The Jungle</i>, creates a stir.</p>	<p>SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC TRADE-UNIONS COMBINE IN THE <i>Nederlandsch Verbond van Vakvereenigingen</i>.</p>	<p>Constitution granted, but it does not satisfy the masses. THE REVOLUTION CONTINUES.</p> <p>GENERAL STRIKES ADVOCATED AS A WEAPON.</p>	<p>International conference for protection of workers summoned by the Swiss Government.</p>

Year.	England.	France.	Switzerland.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Scandinavian Lands.
1906	THE LABOUR PARTY VERY SUCCESSFUL AT THE ELECTIONS.	THE <i>Confédération générale du Travail</i> IN THE HANDS OF THE SYNDICALISTS, WHO STIR UP GENERAL STRIKES.		THE TRADE UNIONS OPPOSE GENERAL STRIKES. THE SOCIALIST PARTY CONFERENCE AT MANNHEIM DECLARES THAT ITS LAST YEAR'S RESOLUTION IN FAVOUR OF GENERAL STRIKES IS NOT CONTRADICTORY TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS AT COLOGNE.	Universal suffrage introduced.	
1907		ANTI-MILITARY PROPAGANDA SUCCESSFUL. ONE OR TWO REGIMENTS MUTINY.		At the elections the "National" parties combine against the Socialists, who lose half their seats. SECOND CONGRESS OF NON-SOCIALIST TRADE UNIONS (OVER A MILLION MEMBERS).	At the elections UNDER THE NEW FRANCHISE THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS WIN 87 SEATS IN THE REICHSRAT (OVER A MILLION VOTES).	

Italy.	United States.	Holland and Belgium.	Russia.	International.
<p>GENERAL CONGRESS OF TRADE UNIONS DECLARES ITSELF OPPOSED TO SYNDICALISM. SOCIALIST PARTY SPLIT UP AND REUNITE AT THE CONGRESS AT ROME.</p>	<p>THE A. F. OF L. TAKES PART IN ELECTIONS. IT FAVOURS HEARST FOR THE MAYORALTY OF NEW YORK. HEARST DEFEATED.</p>	<p>STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE RADICALS AND THE MIDDLE WING OF THE DUTCH SOCIALIST PARTY. THE LATTER (TROELSTRA) WIN THE DAY.</p>	<p>Duma closed. Terror.</p>	<p>In Berne, thirteen States agree as to regulating employment of women at night, seven as to regulating the use of yellow phosphorus in match-making. Beginning of an international attempt to protect workers. The International Association for the Legal Protection of Workers, at its Congress in Geneva, resolves to agitate for a maximum working day for all.</p>
<p>FIRST CONGRESS OF THE SYNDICALISTS AT FERRARA. THEY FORM THEMSELVES INTO A PARTY INDEPENDENT OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS.</p>	<p>A LABOUR LEADER IN COLORADO TREATED ILLEGALLY. GENERAL MOVEMENT IN HIS FAVOUR.</p>		<p>Second Duma closed.</p>	<p>SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS AT STUTTGART.</p>

RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, F.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

